Results Report and Resources Request

Fiscal Year 2000

United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Humanitarian response

Office of Food for Peace - Strategic Objective 2
"Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity"

20 May 1998

Executive Summary

This Results Review and Resources Request (R4) for fiscal year 2000 is presented by USAID's Office of Food for Peace Strategic Objective 2 (SO2) Team, that supports non-emergency food aid activities. SO2 Team's partners are USAID Missions, USAID/W Regional bureaus, all levels of host governments, U.S. Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), International Organizations (IOs) such as the UN's World Food Program, and other food aid donors. Within this panoply of partners, cooperating sponsors (PVOs/NGOs/IOs) are particularly important for SO2. These entities, whether local, U.S., or European-based, are prime instruments in the delivery of P.L. 480 Title II development assistance. Our ultimate "customers" are the portion of the more than 800 million food insecure people worldwide who receive P.L. 480 development food assistance.

The SO2 team currently supports 60 Cooperating Sponsor-implemented Title II development activities (not including multilateral activities through WFP), operating in 15 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2 countries in South Asia, and 6 countries in Latin America. The total FY 1998 approved value of these activities is $327.3 million, complemented by $10.5 million in section 202 (e) funds for field-related expenses, and approximately $2.1 million in Institutional Strengthening (ISG) Grants, for headquarters-related expenses.

While the SO2 team was successful in achieving a number of FY 1997 targets in certain areas (as this report demonstrates), the continued scarcity of dollar and human resources to support Title II development programming continues to exert a serious constraint on the ability of the SO2 team to achieve its overall goal of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of Title II development activities.

This Report makes a compelling case for increasing staff and financial resources available to the SO2 Team as we strive to meet the Agency commitment to "grow" the Title II development portfolio, while assuring that on-going efforts truly contribute to enhancing food security in the developing world. If additional resources are not provided, the Office will increasingly: (1) be forced to adopt a "minimalist" management approach to the $320 to $400 million allocated annually for development food aid activities; and (2) face the danger of diluting SO2's strategic planning and monitoring-for-results efforts, both of which will limit our ability to ensure that development activities truly enhance food security. To avoid this scenario, BHR/FFP urges the Agency to consider seriously the budgetary increases justified throughout this document.

William T. Oliver
Director,
Office of Food for Peace
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
USAID/W

David R. Nelson
SO1 Team Leader
Office of Food for Peace
Bureau for Humanitarian Response
USAID/W

PART I: Overview and factors affecting performance 1
A. Introduction 1
Food aid and food security 1
Sustainable food security 1
Agency goals 2
Significant developments 3
B. Overview 3
C. Factors affecting program performance 6
Refining priorities 6
Reengineering and redelegation 7
Costs associated with redelegation 7
Integration 7
Technical strengthening resources 8
Management resources 9
Dollar resources for CS strengthening 9
Environmental assessment requirements 10
Constraints in meeting the objective 10
Increasing focus on monetization 11
Greater flexibility in programming 11
Changing types of expertise required 11
Market concerns with increased monetization 11
Decreased demand for value-added products 12
Monetization to compensate for lack of 202 (e) and DA funds 12
New initiatives 13
Policy and management improvements 13
PART II: Progress towards objectives 15
A. Performance overview summary 15
B. Results review 16
Performance analysis 16
New approved DAPs identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators 16
CSs complete baseline data collection and set targets for objectively measurable indicators 18
CSs achieve food security results 18
Performance data tables for Strategic Objective 2 indicators 20
Intermediate results 23
Improvements in CS capabilities (IR2.1.1) 23
DAPs assessed to satisfy DAP review criteria 23
Missions assess that the CS has adequate technical capacity 24
Improvements in USAID Mission capabilities (IR2.1.2) 25
Missions to develop Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority 25
Improvements in SO2 Team capabilities (IR2.1.3) 25
CS feedback on surveys of DAP guidance quality 26
CS and Mission feedback on quality of SO2 team program support 26
Performance data tables for Intermediate Result 2.1 Indicators 28
Integration with other in-country activities (IR2.2.1) 33

Missions assess that the CS has coordinated its activities with other CS, host country, private sector and IO activities 33
CS joint or coordinated M&E activities 33
Integration with the USAID Mission (IR2.2.2) 34
Missions assess that CS activities contribute to Mission objectives 34
Missions assess M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs 34
Integration with other donors (IR2.2.3) 35
Joint United States and European Union (U.S.-EU) food security strategies . . . 35
Joint CS and World Food Program (WFP) food security strategies 35
Performance data tables for Intermediate Result 2.2 indicators 36
Expected progress through FY 2000 39
Closeout and graduation programs 40
Integrated strategic plans 40
Performance data tables 40
Environmental compliance 40
PART III. Status of management contract 40
PART IV. Resource request 41
A. Workforce Requirements 43
B. Operating Expense (Non-Personnel) Requirements 45
Budget Table 1: Operating Expense Requirements 46
C. Development Assistance (DA) Resource Requirements 47
Budget Table 2: Development Assistance Requirements 47
D. Section 202(e) Grants 52
E. Prioritization of Objectives 52
F. Performance Weights and Measures 53

PART I: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE

A. INTRODUCTION

FOOD AID AND FOOD SECURITY

No concern facing the poorest members of developing countries is more fundamental and important than attaining food security.[1] The World Food Summit (November 1996) estimated that food insecurity and malnutrition have remained a serious problem for some 840 million people in the developing world, including more than 180 million severely underweight children. To serve these children, donors were encouraged by the World Food Summit to (1) sharpen the focus of their food aid on the most chronically food insecure countries and regions, (2) provide an appropriate volume of food aid on the basis of need, (3) establish incentives to encourage the best use of food aid, and (4) strive to ensure that food assistance reaches those who have the most responsibility for household food security, women. USAID is committed to accomplishing this, while ensuring that its food aid programs respond to emergencies and help food insecure populations become self-feeding. Additionally, to ensure that food aid promotes food security, USAID encourages that food aid be fully integrated into the national food security plans and priorities of recipient countries, as well as Mission strategic plans, and coordinated with other forms of assistance.

P.L. 480 TITLE II DEVELOPMENT FOOD AID AND THE SO2 TEAM FOCUS ON SUSTAINABLE FOOD SECURITY

The United States P.L. 480 Title II development food aid program (i.e. non-emergency food aid) constitutes the single largest source of USAID funding focused on food security. The SO2 team plays a key role in administering the Title II development portfolio. As a flexible resource which can be programmed in-kind or monetized, food aid can be used to provide direct feeding or to generate local currency for development activities. Monetization can also encourage market development by promoting private sector participation in marketing. Title II development food aid, when fully integrated with other USAID resources, also enhances the effectiveness of child survival, nutrition education, family planning and community development activities. In addition, through food-for-work (FFW) activities, food aid can mobilize poor people's labor to create employment and income, as well as build and strengthen the agricultural infrastructure necessary for sustainable development.

---

1. Food Security, as defined in the U.S. Position Paper for the World Food Summit (November 1996), "exists when all peoples at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient food to meet their dietary needs for a productive and healthy life. Food security has three dimensions: Availability of sufficient quantities of food of appropriate quality, supplied through domestic production or imports; Access by households and individuals to adequate resources to acquire appropriate foods for a nutritious diet; and Utilization of food through adequate diet, water, sanitation, and health care."

TITLE II DEVELOPMENT FOOD AID AND THE SO2 TEAM SUPPORT AGENCY GOALS

While FFP/DP is considered an operating unit, the Title II development activities it administers are carried out in developing countries by Cooperating Sponsors (PVOs and Cooperatives).[2] Title II development activities supported by the SO2 team address food security goals and objectives of the Cooperating Sponsors (CSs), the Missions and the Agency. The degree of support for the goals and objectives by USAID Missions depends upon the degree of integration of the Title II program with Mission strategies. Title II development activities directly and indirectly promote broader USAID goals, including: population stabilization and human health protection; broad-based economic growth and support for agricultural development; environmental protection for long-term sustainability; human capacity built through education and training; and strengthening of democracy and good governance.

SO2 follows USAID's *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper* (issued in 1995) to guide program priorities and resource allocations for Title II activities. In accordance with this policy paper, approximately 83% of Title II development funding supports activities now directed at improving household nutrition (including water and sanitation activities) and agricultural productivity (see table 1). Increased emphasis is being given to increasing Title II development activities in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia--the most food insecure regions of the world.

Additionally, Title II development activities often play a critical, though frequently unrecognized role in strengthening civil society. Title II Cooperating Sponsors work with community-level counterparts, both governmental and non-governmental in strengthening local capacity for strategic planning and decision making, promoting local ownership of the development process, and supporting and reinforcing decentralization policies in many countries. Title II development activities help to lay the groundwork upon which sustainable participation and democracy are built. As CARE/Honduras states, "...effective civil society participation is possible only when the client's role in developing processes is one of ownership and partnership."

Specific USAID Strategic Objectives that are significantly supported by Title II development activities include (roughly in order of Title II's contribution to inputs):

- Infant and child health and nutrition improved and infant and child mortality reduced
- Agricultural development promoted and enhanced
- Sustainable management of natural resources increased
- Access to quality basic education, especially for girls and women, expanded
- Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable
- Active involvement of civil society in the development process promoted
- The potential impact of crises reduced through support for disaster prevention and preparedness

2. The term Cooperating Sponsor, as used in the report, excludes the World Food Program, which implements developmental food aid activities with U.S. Title II support provided by BHR/FFP.

Title II development activities aim for people-level impact

Over the past several years, most Title II development activities have been redesigned to focus on sustainable improvements in the food security of the participants, and a number of Title II development activities, implemented by the CSs, are now documenting intermediate results. Nonetheless, despite significant gains in attaining satisfactory levels of monitoring and evaluation systems, we and our partners will need another two to three years in order to demonstrate across-the-board, people-level impacts.

The SO2 team defines several key management approaches

- Integration of Title II with Mission strategic planning and related decentralization of program management from FFP to Missions are key components of the SO2 team's evolving results strategy.
- Capacity strengthening remains the focus of the SO2 team's strategic plan. The SO2 team supports some discrete technical assistance activities, as well as integration of capacity strengthening and training into its program management and backstopping functions.
- The SO2 team continues outreach to and consultation with the CS community in all phases of program strategy, design, implementation, management, and evaluation.
- The SO2 team continues to seek ways to resolve the increasing tension between the desire for increased programming and quality enhancement, and serious funding and staff constraints.
- Financial and personnel constraints have led to a phased focusing of the provision of technical assistance and training: Missions will be the priority recipients in FY 1998 and FY 1999, followed by the CSs in FY 2000 and FY 2001.

B. OVERVIEW

The SO2 team currently supports 60 Cooperating Sponsor-implemented Title II development activities (excluding WFP), operating in 15 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2 countries in South Asia, and 6 countries in Latin America (see appendix table 1). The total FY 1998 approved value[3] of these activities is $327.3 million, complemented by $10.5 million in section 202 (e) funds for field-related expenses and approximately $2.1 million in Institutional Strengthening Grants (ISG) for strengthening CS technical and administrative capacity at headquarters. The 202 (e) funds are provided to cover the dollar costs (as opposed to local currency needs, which are often covered through monetization or host-country contributions) associated with implementing Title II food aid activities.

Title II development activities support interventions in 6 technical areas, with a focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity (see table 1 on p. 4).

3. Total value includes commodity plus freight.

Table 1. FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component		
Food security component	percent of total commodity volume	percent of total value (commodity + freight)
Health & Nutrition	41.5	46.8
Water & Sanitation	2.8	2.9
Agriculture	37.2	30.7
Natural Resource Management	2.0	2.4
Education	8.0	8.3
Micro-Enterprise	0.4	0.3
Humanitarian Assistance	8.1	8.6
Total FY 1998 Title II Development Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives	727,840 mt	$327 million
Title II Development Funding through the World Food Program (approximate)	150,000 mt	$50 million
Total FY 1998 Title II Development Funding	877,840 mt	$377 million

Approximately half of Title II development resources ($160 million - see table 1) are used in **Health and Nutrition and Water and Sanitation** activities, which directly support proven interventions to improve child survival and nutrition, such as promotion of exclusive breastfeeding, prevention and treatment of preventable childhood diseases, including diarrhea, increased micronutrient consumption, and improvements in ante-natal care (see box 1).

One third of Title II development resources, approximately $107 million, are used to support **Agriculture and Natural Resource Management** activities. These activities work at the community level with small farmers and their families, providing technical assistance and training to promote

Box 1

Title II Support for the Integrated Child Development Services program (ICDS) in India

The single largest Title II development activity, implemented by CARE in **India**, supports the Indian Government's ICDS program, which delivers health, nutrition and pre-school services to over half of India's mothers and children (CARE's activity alone reaches a staggering 6.6 million beneficiaries annually). During FY 1997, monitoring data show increases in the percent of infants breast-fed within 8 hours after birth from 30 percent to 60 percent, and similar percentages being breast-fed exclusively for the first four months of life. The percent of children under two completely immunized increased to 55 percent, compared to a baseline of 30 percent. The current use of modern family spacing methods increased to 20 percent, compared with 6 percent at baseline. These improvements will lead to healthier and better nourished children, which is expected to result in smaller, healthier families.

Box 2

Food for the Hungry International (FHI) Bolivia works with small farmers

During FY 1997 the FHI **Bolivia** Title II development activity assisted 3600 farming households (approximately 18,000 people) to increase total production of selected basic food crops by 39 percent, which led to an increase of 56 percent in total sales and a 69 percent increase in household income from agriculture related activities.

sustainable farming practices, more productive and more diversified farming systems, and improved post-harvest management and marketing (see box 2). Title II agricultural activities often include the improvement of physical resources through the construction of small-scale irrigation and drainage systems, as well as soil and water conservation infrastructure through food-for-work programs. These activities increase sustainable yields, thus contributing to improvements in the availability of and access to food by poor rural households, both now and in the future.

Since 1993, the SO2 team has been improving the programming of Title II development resources to maximize sustainable, long-term food security benefits. One result has been the transformation of school feeding (SF) activities. Many "stand-alone" SF activities have been phased out, in recognition that SF in the absence of significant reforms of the school system will not contribute to long-term food security objectives. While attendance may be increased or maintained because of SF, children fail to learn due to inadequacies in the quality of the education they receive. To insure food is used to enhance quality education, the SO2 team promotes **Food for Education** (FFE) activities that integrate food resources with programs to improve the quality of teaching (staff and curriculum) and school infrastructure. The governments in countries where school feeding activities have been continued or expanded- for example, **Bolivia**, **Ghana**, **Burkina Faso**, **Haiti** - are enacting large scale school reform programs aimed at improving the quality of the education system. Additionally, many FFE activities include components focused on increased school attendance of girls (see box 3).

Box 3

Title II supports innovative approaches to keeping girls in school

In **Bolivia**, schools must maintain no less than 40 percent enrollment of girls in order to participate in the Food for Education programs implemented by ADRA, Food for the Hungry, and Project Concern International. In **Burkina Faso**, CRS is implementing pilot activities to test two innovative approaches to increasing girls' enrollment and attendance in primary school. One approach involves providing a monthly take-home ration to girls who maintain at least 85 percent attendance throughout the month, to provide familial incentives to keep their daughters in school. The second approach involves the provision of meals at community pre-school centers which care for the female students' younger siblings, thus providing an alternative source of child care which enables older girls to attend school. CRS/**India** is implementing similar activities to increase girls' attendance at school.

Box 4

Community banks in Peru

PRISMA **Peru** is implementing an activity to establish community banking systems in sites that participate in the community-based health and nutrition program. Loans are provided under the group solidarity guarantee approach, which achieved a 100 percent repayment rate during FY 1997.

Some Title II development activities support **Micro-enterprise** credit components designed to improve agricultural productivity and household nutrition, to expand the choices and opportunities for productive activities of the target population. In health and nutrition activities, group lending approaches can build on the solidarity and organization of the mothers' groups, thereby increasing short and longer term access to resources by women (see box 4).

Title II development activities are designed to achieve sustainable impact on food insecurity. However, a natural or man-made crisis has the potential of derailing a development activity plan. In areas prone to crises, the SO2 team encourages the CSs to develop plans to deal with the transitory food insecurity caused by an emergency while keeping the development activity on track. Several Title II development activities in Africa thus include **Disaster Mitigation and Response** components (see box 5).

Box 5

Using school networks for rapid response

CRS, **Burkina Faso**'s Title II development-funded Food for Education (FFE) Program includes an Emergency Preparedness and Response Program (EPRP), that ensures rapid response to drought and other natural disasters. The EPRP mechanism uses the primary school network; the schools become the channel for delivery of emergency relief, regardless of whether the school currently participates in the FFE activity. EPRP includes a local currency reserve for quick purchase of food commodities in emergency situations.

C. FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The continued scarcity of dollar and human resources to support Title II development programming continues to exert a serious constraint on the ability of the SO2 team to achieve its goal of improving the effectiveness of Title II development activities. While the SO2 team was successful in achieving some FY 1997 targets in certain areas, these successes have come at the cost of increased customer dissatisfaction, further erosion in the SO2 team's ability to respond to program needs in a timely manner, increased turnover of FFP staff, and difficulties in meeting the objective of managed growth of the Title II development portfolio.

REFINING PRIORITIES FOR THE MOST EFFECTIVE USE OF SCARCE RESOURCES

Insofar as the Title II development portfolio is large and diverse, the types of activities implemented vary widely, as do the levels of CS capability and USAID Mission presence and interest. The SO2 team has developed a strategy to focus scarce management and technical resources to facilitate decentralization of program management, thus encouraging the most efficient use of resources where they are available.

REENGINEERING AND REDELEGATION

The Agency reengineering and decentralization processes present the SO2 team with a valuable opportunity to strengthen the Title II development program by moving the backstopping of the program closer to the field. In order to do this, the SO2 team is working to delegate Title II development Previously Approved Activity (PAA) approval authority, to the extent legally permissible, to six full-service USAID Missions that have demonstrated adequate capacity for managing the Title II development resources and that have integrated these resources into the Mission's portfolio. (PAAs are annual funding requests for DAPs that were previously approved by BHR.) Feedback received from Missions indicates strong support for the redelegation of Title II development program authority (see box 6), although concern was expressed by one Mission about its own limited staff resources.

Box 6

USAID/Dhaka supports re-delegation

USAID/**Dhaka** had the following comment in its response to the FY 1997 annual survey on the quality of FFP support: "FFP is to be commended for its re-engineering efforts, especially re-delegation to the field...suggest you continue those efforts, while at the same time continuing to work with your cooperators and Missions to set program standards of excellence that all are expected to strive to adhere to. Doing so is the only way that we can expect to fully integrate Food Aid into Mission and AID/W strategies."

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REDELEGATION

While most Missions support the concept of redelegation of PAA approval authority, they also stress that they will need support from the SO2 team in order to make decentralization and redelegation work. As USAID/**Maputo** stated in its response to the FY 1997 survey on FFP support: "Certainly the biggest challenge to Missions is to adequately review and constructively criticize and control the quality of the massive amounts of program design and implementation documents that are channeled through the Missions and onto USAID/W every year. Regional and global bureaus have made TDY expertise available to assist Missions in the preparation of R4s, activity descriptions, strategies, etc., and BHR should do something similar when it comes to annual reports, PAAs, DAPs, Bellmons, etc. We realize that plans are underway for such assistance, and every effort should be made to publicize and make such assistance accessible, once the vehicles are in place."

INTEGRATION OF TITLE II DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

Critical to successful decentralization of Title II development PAA authority is the integration of Title II development resources into the Missions' strategic planning process. Integration is desirable to maximize the complementarity and synergy of Title II development-supported activities with other in-country development interventions, Mission objectives, and other donor strategies. Results indicate that Title II integration is more likely to occur when strong technical assistance is provided to the Missions and the CSs by the SO2 team and its technical consultants, or when Missions can directly access food-security-related technical support.

Much remains to be done in this regard, to ensure an adequate level of technical assistance is available to enhance Title II integration and effectiveness. The SO2 team and Missions must be able to continue to access Global Bureau sources of technical support, such as the new Food and Nutrition

Technical Assistance (FANTA) project, currently under design, for direct technical support to the SO2 team in the review of Title II development activities., to strengthen the SO2's partners, and to influence the direction of FANTA's operations research agenda, maximizing potential contributions to improved food security program design and implementation. Missions will also be able to access technical support through this new project for capacity strengthening of Mission and CS staff in food security program design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

PRIORITIZING SCARCE TECHNICAL STRENGTHENING RESOURCES

The need for technical strengthening resources is great, and is not met by the levels currently provided to FFP. Because limited staff and dollar resources make it impossible to address all of the critical technical assistance needs in the short term, and to expedite the redelegation process, the SO2 team will focus its technical strengthening resources and activities in the short term on facilitating the Missions in their assumption of Previously Approved Activities (PAA) approval authority. In part, this will be done through increased TDYs to the targeted Missions. Although strengthening of the CSs will not be FFP's primary focus in FY 1998 and FY 1999, FFP expects that strengthening and empowering the Missions will also serve to strengthen the CSs by improving the quality of the support and guidance they receive from Missions. In addition, technical and programmatic support to both Missions and CSs is provided during TDYs by the SO2 team staff and contractor technical experts (see box 7).

Box 7

TDY assistance to Missions and CSs

FFP funds through the G/PHN IMPACT project financed the participation of a food security M&E specialist on a SO2 team that traveled to **Peru** to take part in the in-field review of four Title II PAAs and one DAP for FY 1998. The food security M&E specialist assisted the Title II CSs and the USAID/Peru Mission by providing a critical review of CSs' proposals, preparing a set of issues for the benefit of both the CSs and USAID that were addressed during the scheduled Mission reviews, and recommending corrective measures to enhance the degree of success or achievement of desirable results from activity implementation. Support was provided in the following areas: (1) integration of food aid activities into the Mission's strategic plan and contribution to strategic objectives; (2) activity targets and degrees of achievement; (3) the appropriateness of technical approaches and validity of key assumptions; and (4) the management information system, including the appropriateness of indicators, the adequacy of baselines for impact assessment, consistency of indicators with USAID's generic Title II indicators, and the adequacy of monitoring and reporting systems.

Similar TDY technical assistance was provided during in-country PAA reviews in **Mozambique**. The Mission acknowledged the value of the assistance received during the TDY, and of the feedback received from the SO2 team throughout the year: "At the time of the FY 1998 Previously Approved Activity reviews in May, 1997, significant design and implementation support was provided to the cooperating sponsors in country by FFP TDY staff (including a G/PHN supported IMPACT technical expert), primarily in the area of health and nutrition. Additional technical support has been provided throughout the year from FFP/Washington, in the form of commentary on program design and implementation documents. Guidance on program design and implementation is useful, especially with respect to indicators."

During the next two years, the SO2 team will continue to support capacity building and institutional strengthening of the CSs both directly and indirectly, in part by continuing to negotiate better standards of what is required, acceptable, and feasible for quality development food aid programming. A streamlined but technically sound DAP review process is critical. Actions taken to ensure effective and efficient proposal reviews include the development of clear and concise guidelines, an increased focus on pre-determined review criteria, and input from technical experts during the review. For example, technical input provided by G/PHN food security and M&E experts has been a critical component of increasing the technical rigor of the proposal review process. Adequate DA resources must be made available in order that the SO2 team continues to access this and related technical support from the Global Bureau, and to expand the focus of its technical support, as described in the Resource Request, Development Assistance budget section of this document.

PRIORITIZING SCARCE MANAGEMENT RESOURCES

With the closure of REDSO/WCA, the two food aid, backstop (BS) 15 positions are being moved to Mali and will continue to provide regional food aid backstopping. In addition, bilateral Missions have been assigned "twinning" responsibility for non-presence countries for food aid and other activities. Despite attempts by the Africa Bureau to ensure continued field backstopping of food aid activity in sub-Saharan West Africa, it is likely that the number of Title II development activities being implemented in non-presence countries will increase (given the desire to increase programming in the food-insecure countries of Sub-Saharan Africa, where there are frequently no USAID Missions). It is also important to note that under the P.L. 480 legislation, as amended in April, 1996, a DAP cannot be rejected solely on the basis of being in a non-presence country. Consequently, there is an increased burden on the SO2 team to backstop activities in non-presence countries. In addition, program and administrative support will still be required by those Missions operating under a MOU, and by the CSs operating in MOU countries. Thus, the SO2 team will need to insure that staff, OE and DA resources are available to help meet the challenges of Title II development program implementation in all countries, particularly those without USAID Missions.

The increasing number of countries in transition from relief to development present another challenge and priority for SO2 staff as field Missions and CSs in countries such as **Rwanda**, **Liberia**, and **Angola** will require an increasing commitment of resources to provide training and support in the shift from emergency to development programming.

INCREASED NEED AND LIMITED SUPPLY OF DOLLAR RESOURCES FOR CS STRENGTHENING

The growing disparity between the availability and the need for complementary dollar resources to support the implementation of quality food assistance activities has been an important constraint to improving the capacity of the SO2 team and its partners, particularly to allow for the "managed growth" of Title II development programming.

The most important source of funds for strengthening PVOs is the Institutional Strengthening Grants (ISG - now ISA - Institutional Strengthening Assistance). ISG funds are used to strengthen CS headquarters technical and administrative capacity. The amount of funding available for ISGs is generally considered insufficient to meet identified needs. Consequently, over the last several years, FFP has programmed some scarce 202 (e) funds to support the ISGs.

USAID REGULATION 216 - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

The addition of USAID Regulation 216 environmental assessment requirements to Title II development activities has also increased CSs' need for supplemental resources. The CSs have made important advances in meeting the requirement to conduct environmental assessments, however, continued support is necessary in order to meet the goal of having all post-1998 DAPs comply with USAID Regulation 216.

CONSTRAINTS IN MEETING THE OBJECTIVE OF TITLE II "MANAGED GROWTH"

The SO2 team and its partners agree that managed growth of the Title II development portfolio is both desirable and necessary. However, there are several factors which limit the ability to increase the number of Title II development activities, including the lack of dollar resources to support programs as described:

- Lack of resources to support CS headquarters. A recent joint communication from a number of CSs to the BHR/AA stated:

  "The ISGs...have been pivotal in the development of technical capacities within our organizations to ensure higher quality in the design, implementation and management of Title II programs... The need for this assistance will not decrease... especially since we are all striving to increase Title II activities in Africa, which offers unique challenges and requires innovative approaches. Continued levels are also needed to assist Cooperating Sponsors to meet enhanced USAID program assessment, management, evaluation and environmental assessment requirements.";

- Lack of dollar resources to support the field costs of increased programming;

- Lack of FFP management resources to support additional programming;

- Reluctance on the part of some USAID field Missions to accept new food aid activities due to the management requirements associated with these resources;

- Reluctance on the part of some PVO field staff to incorporate food aid into their development activities due to a concern about increasing dependency on external food assistance; and

- More rigorous approval standards by FFP, resulting in some submissions being rejected.

INCREASING FOCUS ON MONETIZATION

Increasingly, Title II development commodities are being monetized rather than directly distributed to project beneficiaries. The proportion of Title II development commodities that are monetized has increased from 13.2% in FY 1993 to 39.6% in FY 1997. This trend to increasing monetization presents both opportunities and challenges for the CSs and the SO2 team, described below.

Greater flexibility in programming

The CSs recognize, appreciate and need the greater flexibility that monetization permits in order to design and implement quality food security programming. The monetization of Title II development commodities allows CSs to generate funds to implement food security-related activities in support of direct distribution of commodities. In addition, it permits CSs to implement activities that do not have direct distribution for food as a component, when the food security problem assessment has identified other aspects that need to be addressed to bring about long-term sustainable increases in food security. For example, food rations might be used in food-for-work activities to construct small-scale irrigation networks, while local currencies from monetization are used to support agricultural extensionists who provide training in new cropping techniques to maximize the benefit of the new irrigation system. In another activity, 100 percent of commodities might be monetized to support the establishment of village banks that increase the access of women to small loans. The flexibility that monetization affords lets the CSs design and implement activities that can more closely respond to the needs identified in the food security problem assessment.

Changing types of expertise required

Monetization has the additional benefit of reducing some of the management and accountability challenges of implementing and monitoring an activity of direct distribution of commodities; however, successfully implementing large-scale monetization programs requires a different and equally challenging set of expertise. As the size and number of monetization sales are increasing, the level of sophistication required by the CSs to plan and execute the sales is increasing, since in-depth sales analysis are required as well as the traditional Bellmon (storage and production and market disincentives) certification. In addition, there are increased requirements for cost-recovery: CSs must obtain 100% of the Free Alongside Ship (FAS), or 80% of the Commodity and Freight (C&F) value of the commodity, whichever is great.

Market concerns with increased monetization

While monetization can and does play an important role in the implementation of activities that are able to address the principal determinants of food insecurity, there are two potential problems resulting from increased monetizations. First, the amounts of commodities being monetized are starting to have Bellmon amendment implications in some countries with relatively small markets (e.g. **Uganda**). While the Farm Bill legislation permits third-country monetization (monetizing commodities in one country and using the currencies generated to fund activities in another country in the same region), some countries and even some regions may not have the capacity to absorb greatly increased amounts of monetized commodities without possible disincentives to local production. In addition, a number of practical constraints (e.g. currency regulations) may further limit the scope for third-country monetization.

Decreased demand for value-added products

In addition, concern has been expressed that the rapid increase in the proportion of Title II development commodities that are monetized may make it more difficult to meet the P.L. 480 Legislation-mandated minimums for value-added commodities, particularly the processed and blended products. In FY 1997 the minimum for value-added commodities was almost met (73.3 percent instead of 75 percent), even with 40 percent of Title II non-emergency commodities being monetized.

However, there have been shifts in FY 1998 commodity PVO requests - i.e., noticeable increases for non value-added bulk commodities such as soybean meal, crude degummed soy oil and wheat, while requests for wheat flour and soy fortified soy grits have decreased.

The greatest demand for processed and blended products is in Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition (MCH/N), Humanitarian Relief (HR - including institutional feeding activities - e.g. hospitals, orphanages) and Food for Education (FFE) activities (formerly School Feeding (SF) activities). As the Title II development portfolio has become more tightly focused on achieving sustainable improvements in food security by focusing increasingly on the priorities identified in the USAID *Food Security and Food Aid Policy Paper* (agricultural productivity and household nutrition), there has been a movement away from supporting HR activities as part of development activities, because the resources invested in these types of activities are less likely to directly contribute to sustainable food security in the short to medium term.

Another result of the improved food security focus of the Title II development activities is that school feeding activities being implemented without significant reforms of the school system are being phased out. However, the newly announced Presidential African Education Initiative may offer more opportunities to implement FFE activities in support of investments to improve the access to and quality of basic education in Africa. An expansion in the number of FFE activities might cause an increase in the demand for processed and blended foods, thus helping to balance the increased demand for non-blended commodities increasingly used in monetization programs.

Monetization to compensate for lack of 202 (e) and DA funds

While the main impetus for the increasing proportion of Title II development resources being monetized is the CSs' desire for greater flexibility in food security programming and the reluctance of some CSs to do any direct distribution of commodities, some of the increase in monetization is driven by the need to compensate for the shortage of 202 (e) funds. The use of monetization to cover 202 (e) needs, however, is typically limited to those budget items that can be purchased with local currency. Local currency usually can not be used to procure some important inputs for quality Title II programming, including procurement of external technical assistance and equipment.

The increased demand for monetization is also being driven by a lack of DA resources for development programs. As DA funds diminish, there is greater demand by the CSs for monetizing a large proportion, if not all, of the Title II development commodities under a DAP, even though funding an activity with local currencies from monetization may be more complicated and burdensome for the CSs.

NEW INITIATIVES

The USG has focused its policy and development efforts on a number of exciting and timely initiatives, which present increased opportunities to use Title II development resources, but which may also place greater demands on the SO2 team for backstopping and coordination. These on-going and new initiatives include the African Food Security Initiative, the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, the African Education Initiative, and the Transatlantic Agenda.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Guided by USAID's 1995 *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper*, progress has been made in facilitating and encouraging the use of food security as a framework for food aid programming, monitoring, evaluation and impact measurement; enhancing the management and monitoring capability of the CSs and USAID; and improving the ability of USAID and its partners to report on the food security impact of food aid, as directed by the July 1993 GAO audit report.

The changes initiated in FY 1995 led to development of a revised Strategic Plan for Strategic Objective 2 during FY 1997. The revised Strategic Objective 2 is: **Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity** (see Figure 1). During FY 1997, the SO2 team continued to work closely with its food assistance partners to:

- better target development food aid for long-term sustainable improvements in food security by basing Development Activity Proposal (DAP) design on sound food security problem analysis, using a well-tested conceptual framework and with a focus on priority activities and geographic areas;
- develop and apply higher standards for Title II development submissions;
- hold more open and rigorous technical reviews of DAPs;
- develop guidance for environmental review of Title II development activities;
- work closely with host country counterparts and non-governmental organizations to ensure sustainability through increased local capacity and program ownership;
- better integrate Title II development food aid as components of USAID Mission strategic planning;
- improve collaboration with other major food aid donors;
- improve program design, incorporating sound monitoring and evaluation systems; and
- continue to develop and refine common, generic food aid performance indicators and mutually acceptable methodologies that partners and USAID can use in measuring the impact of food aid.

Figure 1: FFP SO2 Strategic Plan Results Framework Summary

Goal: Improved household nutrition and agricultural productivity among targeted vulnerable groups.

Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity

SO2 Indicators:

2.1 Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance.

2.2 Percentage of partner's activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively measurable indicators within first year of implementation.

2.3 Percentage of partner's annual targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators.

Intermediate Results 2.1:
Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs.

IR2.1.1: Indicators of PVO capabilities
a. Percentage of DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.
B. Percentage of PAAs for which Missions assess that PVOs have adequate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring programs.

IR2.1.2: Indicators of USAID Mission capabilities
a. Percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions.
b. Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority.

IR2.1.3: Indicators of FFP capabilities
a. Percentage of scores 3 or above by PVOs on surveys of DAP guidance quality.
b. Percentage of scores of "good" or "excellent" by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.

Intermediate Results 2.2:
Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.

IR2.2.1: Indicators of integration of activities
a. Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO has coordinated its activities with other PVO, host country, private sector and IO activities to great extent or better.
b. Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities.

IR2.2.2: Indicators of integration with Missions
a. Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO activities contribute to Mission objectives to a great extent or better
b. Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs to great extent or better.

IR2.2.3: Indicator of integration with other donors
a. Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed.
b. Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.

PART II: PROGRESS TOWARDS OBJECTIVES

A. PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW SUMMARY

Objectives and IRs	Rating	Evaluation Findings/ Corrective Actions
SO 2: Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity	Exceeded (for those indicators for which data is available. Effectiveness of partners in achieving food security impacts not reported, since FY 97 is baseline year.)	
IR2.1: Strengthened capabilities of CSs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs.	Failed to meet	-Improved Guidelines for Title II Program documents distributed -Consultative process with partners; expediting redelegation of authority during FY 1998 to rationalize use of scare FFP staff
IR2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.	Exceeded (note - some integration indicators will be revised to improve sensitivity to actual integration)	
Percent DA funding through Implementing Partners (Cooperating Sponsors): FY 1997 - 57%, FY 1998 - 2000 - N/A Note: 100% of Title II development funding is implemented by NGO Cooperating Sponsors - PVOs, Cooperatives and the WFP.		

B. RESULTS REVIEW

1. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security, with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity

Strategic Objective 2 and its associated indicators are not defined in terms of specific people-level impact targets, but rather in terms of the degree to which FFP's partners are able to achieve and measure the people-level targets that *they* set. This approach follows directly from the *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper* which recommends that responsibility for the *managing-for-results* system fall primarily on the CSs and USAID Missions, and in turn, that these field managers will be given flexibility to propose activities they believe will have the greatest food security impacts. The three SO2 indicators are thus designed to measure the results of SO2 team efforts to improve the capacity of FFP's partners to implement food security activities and to manage and report on the results of those activities. The three indicators measure the capacity of the CSs to: (1) design food security M&E systems; (2) implement food security M&E systems; and (3) **achieve food security results**. The targets set for two indicators were met or exceeded during FY 1997, and a baseline for the third indicator was established.

However, the SO indicators and the results reported below also reflect that the focus of the SO2 team strategy implementation to date has been limited, with SO2 team technical assistance concentrated on improving the ability of the CSs to manage Title II development activities by results, and to respond to the 1993 GAO recommendation to establish systems that allow the Agency to report on the impact of food aid on food security. While this support has been critical, a great deal remains to be done to broaden technical assistance to encompass strengthening the problem definition, design, and implementation of sustainable Title II development activities; to improve the linkage between activities in agriculture and improvements in household nutrition; to develop and test protocols for appropriate use of food aid; and to document and disseminate best practices as the SO2 team and its partners acquire more experience in food security programming.

New approved DAPs identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators. (Indicator 2.1)

The CSs have made progress in improving the M&E components of their Title II DAPs, including the addition of M&E experts to headquarters' staff, usually funded through ISGs. The CSs have also constituted a joint M&E working group through Food Aid Management (FAM). The results of the increased attention paid to M&E is demonstrated through SO Indicator 2.1, as the FY 1997 target was exceeded by 50 percent: approximately three quarters of the new approved FY 1997 DAPs incorporated performance indicators to demonstrate the impact of the activity on the food security of the vulnerable populations. These results reflect the SO2 team's efforts to raise the standards expected of Title II activities (as demonstrated by CSs' DAPs), and the SO2 team's willingness to reject proposals that do not meet these higher standards.

Specific SO2 team efforts have included approval of ISG and 202 (e) funds to strengthen CSs' field and headquarter M&E capacity and provision of direct technical assistance in M&E to CSs and Missions through the G/PHN IMPACT and Linkages projects (see box 8).

Technical assistance thus far has been accessed through a "buy-in" to G/PHN's Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring (IMPACT) project, to enhance assistance to the CSs and the SO2 team in food security M&E (FFP funds leveraged additional support through G/PHN core funding of IMPACT for which G/PHN provided approximately $1 for each $1 of DA funds transferred into the IMPACT project by FFP). This G/PHN technical support has been a critical component of the SO2 team's strategy for institutional strengthening. G/PHN is currently in the process of designing a follow-on and expanded project to IMPACT (the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) project), whose support is critical to FFP's attainment of its strategic plan.

Box 8

The SO2 team draws on Global Bureau support for the Title II development activities

During FY 1997, the SO2 team supported the production of guides on measurement and reporting of the generic Title II development activity indicators, through G/PHN's IMPACT project. The list of generic Title II indicators was developed in consultation with the SO2 team's partners during FY 1996. The CSs requested guidance on appropriate, cost-effective methods for collecting, analyzing and reporting the information. In response, several guides were completed and distributed, while drafts of others were produced and distributed in draft, with final versions scheduled to be distributed in FY 1998. In addition to work on the guides, IMPACT provided direct assistance to several CSs in the review and improvement of M&E components of Title II activities, and provided in-depth review and comments on the M&E components of all FY 1997 DAPs and FY 1998 PAAs.

Several FY 1998 DAPs were not approved due to weaknesses in proposal design and presentation and the reasons for not approving these DAPs were communicated to the CSs. Meetings were held with some CSs to discuss the weaknesses in the proposals and identify ways that future proposals could be improved. The SO2 team believes that this process of feedback by SO2 team members and FFP-G/PHN contract technical experts to individual CSs is critical to strengthening CSs' capacity for good program design and their ability to produce high-quality proposals that include strong M&E components. This feedback, which is not restricted to cases where a proposal was rejected but rather is a constant part of the day-to-day work of the SO2 team members, combined with the improved FY 1999 Guidelines and the results of ISG-funded institutional strengthening, is expected to contribute to a qualitative improvement in the FY 1999 DAPs.

CSs complete baseline data collection and set targets for objectively measurable indicators. (Indicator 2.2)

One important recommendation of the 1993 GAO audit highlighted the need to put in place information systems that will enable USAID to report on the impact of the Title II development activities on food security. To accomplish this, it is critical that CSs establish baseline data on selected indicators of the food security status of the target population at the time an activity is initiated.

The SO2 team recognizes that while many CSs may not have the resources to carry out baseline studies prior to receiving Title II funding, they are expected to complete baseline studies and set or refine performance targets during the first year of implementation. Eighty-eight percent of the FY

1997 DAPs met this goal during FY 1997, which significantly exceeds the FY 1997 target of 60 percent. These promising results lead the SO2 team to believe that the target of all activities meeting this challenge can be met by FY 2000.

CSs achieve food security results. (Indicator 2.3)

The annual CS Results Reports (R2s) are the principal source of regular information on the results of a Title II development activity. The quality of the R2 reflects the quality of the M&E system (including baseline and targets) that has been established for the DAP. Thus, the SO Indicator 2.3 is dependent on quality R2 reporting in order to determine whether a DAP is on track to achieving its food security objectives.

Real improvements have been noted in the in the performance reporting information and quality of many of the R2s received for FY 1997. Better reporting by the CSs facilitates the integration of Title II development activities results into Mission R4s. For example, a FFP-supported technical advisor wrote the following review of a CS FY 1997 Results Report:

> "WVRD (**Mozambique**) has done an excellent job in putting together the FY 1997 Results Report. They have combined reporting from the programs supported by Mission funding and have detailed methods, results, next steps and recommendations for improvements to the system. WVRD has exercised a high degree of commitment to reporting on impact and has exceeded minimum requirements for its large and technically rigorous program. The Results Report represents one of the best examples of a CS Title II reporting system."

Although R2 reporting has improved, there is still room for further progress, as approximately 40 percent of DAPs did not report performance indicator results in their FY 1997 R2s. These R2s contained information only on input, process, or output indicators; or did not compare what was achieved in FY 1997 to what was targeted. Most of the R2s, however, that do not contain performance indicator information are pre-1996 activities that were funded prior to the shift in focus to managing for results and reporting food security impacts, or are FY 1997 activities that did not report performance indicator results due to the newness of the activities.

Box 9

ACDI on track to achieving sustainable improvements in the food security of Cape Verdians

One example of the types of results being achieved comes from the new five-year ACDI activity in **Cape Verde**. ACDI reports in their FY 1997 R2 that results well beyond targets were achieved in 90 percent of its soil and water conservation work indicators. Per capita income in rural households working with profit-generating farmer associations improved by 111 percent (by 151 percent in households headed by women). Soil erosion was reduced by 71 percent on side slopes of rained fed lands (178 percent above target) and 38,460 m^3 of surface area was reclaimed for cultivation.

Nonetheless, the 60 percent of Title II development activities that do report results are on track to achieve their planned LOP impacts. On average, 69 percent of targets were achieved during FY 1997 (see box 9).[4]

In addition to the R2s, a large number of mid-term evaluations will be carried out in FY 1998, and should provide a wealth of information on progress towards people-level food security impacts (see box 10).

Box 10

Evaluation results lead to management improvements in India

In Andhra Pradesh, **India**, CARE has instituted significant management changes based on recommendations from a BHR-led impact evaluation. CARE no longer has food monitors based in a central city who carry out monitoring visits independently of the district government. They now have block coordinators who live on-site and work very closely with the ICDS program and medical officers. CARE has moved ahead with performance -based management; the block coordinators are part of monthly government sectoral meetings. USAID/New Delhi concludes that the Title II-funded integrated health and nutrition activity is going well, and that Andhra Pradesh is a real model for the more challenging northern states of India.

By using the results of the mid-term evaluations, the SO2 team's FY 2001 R4 should be able to report on the achievement of a more complete range of partner results. While recognizing the improbability of all CSs meeting all their targets all the time, the SO2 team believes that the baseline of 69 percent can be improved to 75 percent during FY 1998, and by a further 5 percent/annum during FY 1999 - FY 2001.

These improvements will be the result of direct and indirect strengthening of CSs' capacity by the SO2 team, as well as CS and FAM investments (with FFP support) into M&E. The strengthening of Missions and redelegation of PAA approval authority will also contribute to the achievement of these targets, by empowering and encouraging USAID Missions (the management entities closest to the CSs field operations) to increase the level and quality of their backstopping support and oversight of CSs activities.

4. Some FY 1997 targets for first year DAPs were not achieved because the activity did not begin implementation until the second or third quarter of the fiscal year. Some of these delays were due to program approval being received after the fiscal year started, and other delays were due to the CS waiting until commodities were received and monetized before commencing activity implementation.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2 INDICATORS

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 1

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Performance Indicator 2.1: Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively-measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Unit of Measurement: Percent of DAPs</td><td>Year</td><td>Planned</td><td>Actual</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Data Source: DAP review scoring sheets</td><td>1996</td><td>baseline year</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>1997</td><td>50</td><td>73</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Indicator Definition: Reviewers use a scale of 1 to 4 to assess 5 indicator criteria to determine whether the DAP identified performance indicators and targets that are: 1) objectively measurable, 2) include specific measurement units, 3) address people-level effects and impacts in addition to monitoring indicators, 4) have clear links to program activities, and 5) include FFP Title II Generic Indicators where possible. The indicator reports the percent of new approved DAPs that score 3 or higher on 50% or more of the indicator criteria.</td><td>1998</td><td>75 (70)*</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>1999</td><td>83 (80)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Comments: During FY 1998 and FY 1999, the SO2 team plans to decrease the level of attention given to improving CS capacity to manage by results, in order to increase the emphasis placed on supporting the process of delegating authority and Mission capacity-building. Nonetheless, the SO2 team expects the M&E components of DAPs to continue to improve, albeit at a decreased rate. The out year targets have been adjusted under the assumption that approximately 12 DAPs will be received each year (19 in FY 2000), and that each year between FY 1998 and FY 2000, the sum of DAPs meeting the indicator criteria will increase by one (two in FY 2000). *(Original target in parenthesis.)</td><td>2000</td><td>92 (90)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2001</td><td>92 (100)</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

NOTE: The scored assessments of the DAPs, based on the review criteria, are NOT used as criteria for DAP approval. The scores are solely used to calculate the R4 indicators (SO2.1 and IR1.1a), and are not aggregated until the R4 process is underway. The FFP Country Backstop Officer (CBO) does not receive the aggregated scores during the DAP review process.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 2

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2: Percentage of partners' activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively-measurable indicators within first year of implementation.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of activities	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: PVO Results Reports.	**1996**	**baseline year**	**39**
	1997	**60**	**88**
Indicator Definition: FY 1996 Results Reports and FY 1998 PAAs for FY 1996-FY 2000 DAPs were reviewed by an M&E technical expert who determined whether a baseline survey had been completed, and targets set within the first year of implementation (i.e. by the end of FY 1996).	**1998**	**90 (70)***	
	1999	**95 (80)**	
Comments: The target of all activities meeting this challenge can be met by FY 2000. ***(Original targets in parenthesis.)**	**2000**	**100 (90)**	
	2001	**100 (90)**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 3

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Performance Indicator 2.3: Percentage of partners' targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Unit of Measurement: Percent of targets achieved

Data Source:
PVO Results Reports (R2s)</td><td>Year</td><td>Planned</td><td>Actual</td></tr>
<tr><td>1996</td><td></td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Indicator Definition:
Average percent of targets achieved across PVOs. Based on reporting by the PVO in their R2s. The performance indicators reported in each Results Report are identified by FFP's contractor M&E technical experts. The percent of performance indicator targets met or exceeded in the FY reported is calculated.

Comments: The SO2 team planned to establish a baseline during FY 1997. The baseline was to establish the percent of targets achieved by the CSs in FY 1996, as reported in their FY 1996 Results Reports (R2s). However, the majority of FY 1996 R2s did not contain much information on the achievement of performance indicators. This was because most FY 1996 R2s were reporting on activities carried out under activities funded prior to the shift in focus to performance monitoring and managing by results. Thus baselines and targets for performance indicators had not been established, and managing by results systems had not been put into place as part of the activity. Because of this lack of information, a FY 1996 baseline for Indicator SO2.3 could not be established. Approximately 60% of FY 1997 R2s contained information that allowed a calculation of the percent of targets achieved for performance indicators, so the baseline has been established using FY 1997 numbers.</td><td>1997</td><td>baseline year</td><td>69</td></tr>
<tr><td>1998</td><td>75</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>1999</td><td>80</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2000</td><td>85</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2001</td><td>90</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

INTERMEDIATE RESULTS

Two intermediate results are identified as critical in order to attain the Strategic Objective of increased effectiveness of the SO2 team's partners in implementing Title II development activities with measurable food security impacts, as described in IR2.1 and IR2.2 below:

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of CS, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs.

The first of the two intermediate results identified as leading to the Strategic Objective of increased effectiveness of FFP's partners is measured through the following sub-set of indicators designed to capture improvements in the capability of CSs, of USAID Missions and of the SO2 team.

IMPROVEMENTS IN CS CAPABILITIES (IR2.1.1)

DAPs assessed to satisfy DAP review criteria. (Indicator 2.1.1a)

More than a quarter (27 percent) of new, approved FY 1998 DAPs met the indicator criteria.[5] Although the FY 1997 target of 50 percent was not met, the SO2 team recognizes that the CSs have made progress in improving both the quality of their proposals and in the process of problem assessment and program design. The FY 1998 approved DAPs were particularly strong in presenting a convincing rationale for the country and the target populations chosen, including an assessment of their relative food security needs; choosing objectives and intermediate results consistent with food security; and identifying performance indicators and targets that were objectively measurable and included specific measurement units, addressed people-level effects and impacts in addition to monitoring indicators, had clear links to program activities, and included the FFP Title II Generic Indicators where possible. ISG funds which are used to strengthen CSs headquarter's support for improved assessment and design; the technical support provided to the SO2 team and its partners through G/PHN; as well as the clear commitment by the CSs to enhance the food security impact of their activities including their willingness to invest their own resources in support of this goal -- have all been critical in bringing about the improvements observed to date.

In addition, the FY 1998 DAP/PAA Guidelines provided revised instructions on DAP preparation and feedback from the CSs on the quality of the FY 1998 DAP/PAA Guidelines (see IR1.3a discussion) confirms that the quality of the Guidelines improved. However, the Guidelines were not finalized in a timely manner, which may have influenced CSs' ability to address the Guidelines in their FY 1998 DAPs[6].

As mentioned in the discussion of SO Indicator 2.1 above, several FY 1998 DAPs were not

---

5. Note: The scored assessments of the DAPs based on the review criteria are not used as criteria for DAP approval. The scores are solely used to calculate the R4 indicators (SO2.1 and IR1.1a), and are not aggregated until the R4 process is underway. The FFP CBO does not receive the aggregated scores during the DAP review process.

6. A draft of the FY 1998 DAP/PAA guidance was issued in near-final form in January 1997.

approved due to weaknesses in proposal design and presentation and the reasons for not approving these DAPs were communicated to the CS. This feedback, combined with the further revised FY 1999 Guidelines, the results of ISG funded institutional strengthening, and continued technical support from G/PHN, should result in a qualitative improvement in the FY 1999 DAPs. While the FY 1997 target may have been optimistic, the SO2 team believes that, given the promising advances noted above, the FY 1998 target for IR Indicator 2.1.1a of 60 percent can be met.

Areas where the approved FY 1998 DAPs were relatively weak included rationale for the proposed ration size and composition; a description of how the proposed activities are integrated with each other, with other food security-related activities of other PVOs/donors/host governments, with food security objectives of Missions, and with non-food resources; and the logistics plan with information on port, storage and inland transport facilities, including logistical problem areas and steps to address them. The SO2 team expects these can be improved through a number of interventions, including the new G/PHN FANTA project which is expected to include an operations research component, that could carry out research on rations used in MCH. The focus on facilitating decentralization of Title II program authority to the field, with its emphasis on integration of Title II and other resources, should be reflected in improved integration of activities in future DAPs. Support for strengthening field capacities through training in management and logistics will help strengthen commodity management.

Missions assess that the CS has adequate technical capacity. (Indicator 2.1.1b)

Improvements in the quality of DAPs is one indicator of strengthened CSs. The SO2 team recognizes, however, that strong programs can submit weak documents and weak programs can hire consultants to write strong proposals. Thus the SO2 team developed Indicator IR1.1b as another measure of CS capacity. The indicator is designed to report the assessment of USAID field Missions on the CSs' capacity to implement, monitor, and evaluate Title II development activities. Missions are asked to provide this assessment because they are in the best position to determine how well the CS's activities are being implemented in the field. The FY 1997 baseline was established through the responses provided by Missions to two scored questions on the technical capacity of a CS for: (1) implementing its development activities; and (2) clearly measuring and reporting the results of its activities.

Sixty-seven percent of CS activities received scores of three or greater on both questions[7]; thus, these CSs are judged to have demonstrated adequate technical capacity. Improvements in CSs' technical capacity were supported both directly and indirectly by the SO2 team in FY 1997, through ISG funds for CSs' headquarter staff strengthening and for Food Aid Management (FAM)-sponsored training workshops, and 202 (e) funds for high quality in-country staff and outside technical assistance. For example, CARE/**Honduras** states in its FY 1997 Results Report that Section 202 (e) funds were critical to the achievement of maximum effectiveness of project activities during FY 1997. The most important activities that were supported with these funds were the Initial Environmental Examination and the Environmental Assessment. In addition, FFP supported the development of a series of guides for the monitoring and evaluation of Title II activities.

IMPROVEMENTS IN USAID MISSION CAPABILITIES (IR2.1.2)

7. A score of 3 = True to great extent; 4 = True without exception.

Missions to develop Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority. (Indicator 2.1.2.b)

The FY 1997 target of three countries with Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) for redelegating Title II development program authority was not reached. Part of the delay in completing MOUs was due to the need to present the proposed process to the SO2 team's CS partners, to solicit and incorporate their feedback, and to address their concerns. Having taken CS views into account, the SO2 team will now be accelerating the process of redelegating Title II PAA authority during FY 1998 and FY 1999. Six countries have been identified as candidates for delegation of PAA authority during FY 1998: **India**, **Bangladesh**, **Haiti**, **Peru**, **Mozambique**, and **Ethiopia**, which represent 72 percent of the FY 1998 Title II development portfolio (based on total value) and 41 percent of DAPs (field activities).

Delegations of authority are expected to encourage greater integration of CS and Mission programs, though unfortunately they will not result in a major reduction of the SO2 team's workload. This is because the SO2 team will continue to provide backstop support to the MOU countries, will maintain management of commodity procurement and shipping responsibilities, and will be responsible for the final approval of new Title II development activities (DAPs) in MOU countries.

IMPROVEMENTS IN SO2 TEAM CAPABILITIES (IR2.1.3)

Redelegation of Title II development program authority with greater emphasis on training for USAID food aid staff is one strategy being pursued by the SO2 team to enhance the integration of food aid into Missions' development portfolios, and to rationalize the use of scarce management resources in FFP. However, at the end of FY 1998, there will still be a large number of activities that will not be delegated (at least 35 activities). Additionally, the need for SO2 team support will be particularly great in non-presence countries, and countries transitioning from relief to development.

Given a fairly high staff turn-over rate, it is critical for the SO2 team to put in place systems that allow new CBOs to be trained and operational as soon as possible, and to monitor how well the SO2 team is meeting the programmatic and administrative needs of its partners. The two indicators of the SO2 team capabilities measure the level of satisfaction of its customers with the quality of the DAP/PAA Guidelines and with SO2 team support in several critical technical, programmatic, and process areas.

CS feedback on surveys of DAP guidance quality. (Indicator 2.1.3a)

The CSs are asked each year to provide feedback on the quality of the DAP/PAA Guidelines by scoring the previous year's Guidelines in four areas: (1) the clarity and detail regarding what is expected in each section of the DAP/PAA; (2) the clarity and detail regarding criteria for accepting or rejecting proposals; (3) timeliness; and (4) overall clarity and detail.

The FY 1997 target of 75 percent of scores of three or above[8] was met in three out of the four areas. For example, a significant improvement was noted in the percent of satisfactory scores for insuring that the Guidelines were sufficiently clear on the criteria for accepting or rejecting proposals (this improved from only 14 percent of CS responses ranking this as acceptable for the FY 1997 Guidelines to 75 percent for the FY 1998 Guidelines). The biggest remaining challenge is to insure that the DAP/PAA guidance is issued in a timely manner. Two impediments to issuing timely guidance are the consultative process with the CSs through which the guidance is developed, and the large number of Agency clearances required on the document.

While the CSs noted that the quality of FY 1998 DAP/PAA Guidelines was better than in FY97, there was still room for improvement. In addition to soliciting feedback from the CSs through a survey on the quality of the Guidelines, a thorough review of the FY 1998 Guidelines was carried out, and several drafts of the FY 1999 Guidelines were produced for feedback. The drafts were widely circulated, and a series of meetings were held with the Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) to discuss and incorporate comments and suggestions. Collaboration with FACG and other SO2 team's partners has been made an integral part of developing the Guidelines. This represents an important joint effort in response to customer feedback and concerns.

The new Guidelines provide clear and complete instructions for the design and format of DAPs and the other required reporting documents, including the criteria for judging DAP submissions. The final FY 1999 DAP/PAA Guidelines were issued in hard copy and electronic copy for easier access and format, in January 1998 - three months earlier in the cycle than the FY 1998 Guidelines. This increases the time CSs have to prepare their submissions, and should affect positively the quality of Title II development proposals.

CS and Mission feedback on quality of SO2 team program support. (Indicator 2.1.3b)

The consequences of the critical shortage of direct-hire FFP staff in relation to the size and diversity of the portfolio being managed is evident from the feedback obtained from CSs and Missions. Respondents to the annual survey on the quality of SO2 team support were asked to rank their satisfaction with the efficiency and timeliness of FFP processes and procedures. Not only was the FY 1997 target not met, but a smaller proportion of customers ranked FFP efficiency and timeliness as good or excellent.

The SO2 team is in the process of developing a procedures manual that will serve as a more complete, step-by-step guide to incoming staff, which is particularly needed given the high rate of turnover on the SO2 team. Consultations are on-going with the CSs on ways of stream-lining the approval and program process. Redelegating approval authority to the field is another strategy the SO2 team is using to expedite the efficiency and timeliness of the approval of on-going activities. However, in the absence of increased workforce and OE, it is questionable whether significant improvements in customer satisfaction can be realized.

8. The CSs score the four areas using the following scale: 1 = No, 2 = Somewhat, 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions), and 4 = Yes.

For SO Indicators 2.1 and 2.2, customer feedback confirms the value of the technical resources the SO2 team has made available through its collaboration with G/PHN. For example, Food for the Hungry International noted the following in its response to the survey of FFP support: "... IMPACT Project has provided good guidance in the areas of health and nutrition, and a good introduction to guidance on agriculture and water and sanitation.... In addition, their guides have been helpful in the areas of sampling, anthropometric measures, consumption, and introduction to agricultural productivity measures."

The SO2 team was ranked as providing good or excellent support by close to 80 percent of respondents in M&E and program management and logistics; the FY 1997 results in both of these areas demonstrate a significant improvement over the FY 1996 baseline. Title II development program management and logistics have been supported through SO2 team participation (in coordination with FFP/POD and the BHR/PPE Nutrition Advisor) in the Commodity Storage and Loss reduction program, that has helped develop specific tools aimed at reducing commodity loss. Moreover, an Interagency process has been focussed on review of improvements in the quality standards for food aid commodities, especially blended foods such as CSB and WSB. The SO2 team has developed a new grant agreement, that consolidates all grant information into a single document. An important contribution to improved management and logistics is the development of the FFP addition to USAID's Web page, which provides timely information on program legislation, policy, and regulations and commodity tracking readily available to partners. Moreover, the SO2 team has released, through notification in the Federal Register, a draft Monetization Manual, with the desire to issue it in final by the end of the second quarter of FY 1998.

G/PHN's SUSTAIN activity, with BHR/FFP funding and BHR/PPE coordination , undertook a Vitamin C pilot study, that resulted in the decision not to increase vitamin C fortification in blended foods above present levels. This saves the food aid program $1.5 million annually. Additionally, the SUSTAIN Micronutrient Assessment Program (MAP), has found considerable variability in vitamin A in sampled wheat flour and other processed and fortified foods, and has provided recommendations to address this.

No improvement was noted in the level of satisfaction with FFP support for program design and implementation; the FY 1997 result was unchanged from the FY 1996 baseline. This result supports the need, as expressed by the SO2 team's partners in other forums, to broaden the scope and focus of technical assistance beyond M&E, in order to improve the performance of this and other indicators (e.g., IR Indicator 2.1.1a - DAPs meeting review criteria).

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES FOR INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.1 INDICATORS

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 4

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.1.1a: Percentage of approved DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of new approved DAPs	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: DAP review scoring sheets	**1996**	**baseline year**	**0**
	1997	**50**	**27**
Indicator Definition: Reviewers assess the DAPs using 11 review criteria (broken down into 33 sub-criteria) on a scale of (1) Not true of this DAP, (2) True to some extent, (3) True to a great extent with a few exceptions, or (4) True without exception or qualification. Satisfying a criteria to "a great extent or better" is defined as scoring an average of 3 or above on each DAP review scoring criteria.	**1998**	**60**	
	1999	**70**	
Comments:	**2000**	**75**	
	2001	**80**	

NOTE: The scored assessments of the DAPs based on the review criteria are NOT used as criteria for DAP approval. The scores are solely used to calculate the R4 indicators (SO2.1 and IR1.1a), and are not aggregated until the R4 process is underway. The FFP CBO does not receive the aggregated scores during the DAP review process.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 5

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.1.1b: Percentage of PAAs for which Missions assess that PVOs have adequate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring programs.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of PAAs	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Mission comments on PAAs	**1997**	**baseline year**	**67**
	1998	**70**	
Indicator Definition: "Adequate" defined as score of 3 or above given by Mission on both technical capacity questions.	**1999**	**75**	
	2000	**80**	
Comments: FY 97 is the baseline from which targets have been established for subsequent years. During FY 1998 and FY 1999, the SO2 team will shift its focus to strengthening Mission capacities and expediting the process of redelegation of PAA approval authority to Missions. Focus will shift back to strengthening PVO capacities during FY 00. Therefore, fairly modest increases are targeted for FY 1998 - FY 2000 (4% in FY 1998, 7% in FY 1999 and 7% in FY 2000). However, significant improvements in PVO technical capacities are anticipated by FY 01. The FY 2001 target represents a 19% increase over FY 2000.	**2001**	**95**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 6

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.1.2a: Percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions.			
Unit of Measurement: % of Missions with Title II development activities	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Mission FAMPs	**1997**	**baseline year**	**N/A**
	1998	**TBD**	
Indicator Definition: (to be further defined)	**1999**	**TBD**	
	2000	**TBD**	
Comments: The SO2 team is currently reviewing the format and content of Food Aid Management Plans (FAMP), which describe a Mission's management structure and processes for managing Title II activities. The FAMP will be streamlined and reformatted into a checklist to serve as a tool to assess Mission Title II program management capacity. The SO2 team will establish a baseline for Mission capacity during FY 1998, using the new checklist format.	**2001**	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 7

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.1.2b: Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of Missions	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: FFP SO2 Team files	**1996**	**0**	**0**
	1997	**3**	**0**
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	**1998**	**6**	
	1999	**7**	
Comments:	**2000**	**9**	
	2001	**10**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 8

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.1.3a: Percentage of scores 3 or above by PVOs on surveys of DAP guidance quality.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of scores 3 or above on each question.	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual (a),(b),(c),(d)***
Data Source: Survey of PVOs on DAP guidance quality	**1996**	baseline year	71, 14, 0, 71
	1997	75% each	100, 75, 0, 75
Indicator Definition: PVOs score the DAP/PAA Guidelines in 4 areas: (a) the clarity and detail regarding what is expected in each section of the DAP/PAA; (b) the clarity and detail regarding criteria for accepting or rejecting proposals; (c) timeliness; and (d) overall clarity and detail, using the following scores: 1= No, 2= Somewhat, 3= Generally yes (yes with exceptions), or 4= Yes.	**1998**	80% each	
	1999	85% each	
Comments:	**2000**	90% each	
	2001	90% each	

* See Indicator Definition for description of each area scored.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 9

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.1.3b: Percentage of scores of "good" or "excellent" by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of scores 3 or greater on survey of quality of FFP support in 4 areas	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual** **(a),(b),(c),(d)***
Data Source: Survey of PVOs/Missions on quality of FFP support	**1996**	baseline year	71, 67, 58, 60
	1997	80% each	71, 80, 77, 53
Indicator Definition: The survey contains seven questions. The first four were scored by the respondents for the purpose of tracking SO2 Team performance. These four questions cover FFP support for: (1) design & implementation; (2) management & logistics; (3) monitoring & evaluation.; (4) efficiency & timeliness. For each question written comments were also requested. For the scored questions, which reflect FY 97 performance, the percent of respondents rating FFP performance as adequate or excellent (i.e., score of 3 or above) was calculated.	**1998**	85% each	
	1999	90% each	
Comments: The FY 1996 baseline has changed because additional survey responses were received after the FY 1999 R4 had been submitted.	**2000**	90% each	
	2001	90% each	

* See Indicator Definition for description of each area scored.

***Intermediate Result 2.2*: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.**

The Agency *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper* emphasizes that food aid "should be integrated to a greater extent with other USAID assistance resources." During FY 1997, the SO2 team took an active role in trying to ensure that USAID Missions with significant food aid activities made resources available to fund complementary activities needed to assure maximum impact. The SO2 team also reminded Missions and CSs to seek greater participation by national/local governments in supporting Title II development activities, as a way of ensuring ownership and sustainability. For example, the government of **India** pays for all costs associated with internal transport, shipping and handling (ITSH) of Title II development commodities. FFP encourages greater coordination in country food security assessments, in program design, and in program monitoring and evaluation among USAID Missions and PVOs, as well as with international organizations (IOs) including the EU, WFP and other donors concerned with food security.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER IN-COUNTRY ACTIVITIES (IR2.2.1)

Missions assess that the CS has coordinated its activities with other CS, host country, private sector and IO activities. (Indicator IR2.2.1a)

See discussion under IR2.2a. This indicator as currently measured is not a sensitive measure of the level of integration of the CS's activities with other organizations' activities. Thus, it will be revised during FY 1998, and a new indicator and baseline established for the FY 2001 R4.

CS joint or coordinated M&E activities. (Indicator 2.2.1b)

The development of joint M&E activities among CSs engaged in similar Title II development activities in the same country has various benefits, given the expense of monitoring and evaluation activities and the limited technical capacity Title II CSs currently have, particularly in the design and implementation of quality evaluations. Not only can joint M&E activities (e.g., joint baseline data collection, joint midterm evaluations) increase M&E efficiency, but by increasing communication among Title II CSs, they can encourage better coordination of overall programming. In addition, joint M&E programs facilitate the integration of Title II development program reporting into the Mission R4 reporting process. In some cases, Missions have funded a portion of M&E costs when indicators are in direct support of Mission reporting.

The FY 1997 target of three countries with joint M&E activities was exceeded. With active support and involvement of the USAID Missions, Title II development activities in four countries, **Bolivia**, **Ethiopia**, **Mozambique**, and **Peru**, have developed joint program monitoring and evaluation systems (coordinated M&E procedures, indicators and/or instruments). For example, in **Bolivia**, the Mission insured that common indicators would be collected by all CSs implementing USAID-funded health and nutrition activities, not just the Title II CS. In **Peru**, the Mission has asked its CS partners to select technical areas, such as nutrition, agricultural productivity, marketing and community participation, and to take the lead on conducting mini-assessments/evaluations in those areas across CSs' activities. These mini-assessments will examine the importance and cost effectiveness of different activities within the sub-programs, with an aim to sharing lessons learned and best practices.

INTEGRATION WITH THE USAID MISSION (IR2.2.2)

Missions assess that CS activities contribute to Mission objectives. (Indicator 2.2.2a)

Recognizing that food aid alone will not be sufficient to bring about sustainable improvements in food security, USAID Missions are encouraged to integrate Title II resources with DA and other funds to meet food security objectives. In **Peru,** USAID/Peru's Title II partners, ADRA, CARE, Caritas/Peru, and PRISMA (the latter two indigenous cooperating sponsors), are implementing activities fully integrated with the Mission's SO of increasing the incomes of the poor and its IR aimed at improving food security by enhancing the capacity of the extremely poor. Title II activities are designed to reach this poorest segment with investments in improving basic infrastructure (e.g. farm to market roads), skills enhancement, micro credit, and training in hygiene and nutrition practices for women. The Mission's Food for Development and Health, Population, and Nutrition Offices participate on each other's strategic objective teams, resulting in standardizing the Mission-supported health and nutrition investments both through Title II and DA-supported activities. Both teams are closely involved in the design and technical supervision of each other's results packages and take advantage of the extensive geographic coverage of **Peru**'s Title II cooperating sponsors to strengthen the impact of USAID's nutrition and other food security-related activities.

Indicator IR2.2a was developed to measure the extent of this kind of integration. Almost all Missions with a food security-related Strategic Objective (89 percent) reported that the CS's Title II funded activities contributed to Mission objectives. As there is still considerable scope for encouraging effective integration of resources, the SO2 team feels that this indicator, as currently defined, and as demonstrated by the baseline numbers, may not be a sensitive enough measure of the integration of Title II and other Mission resources in support of food security priorities in the *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper*. Therefore, instead of setting targets based on the baseline results of 89 percent, the SO2 team may revise and refine this indicator during FY 1998 in order to develop an indicator that can better discriminate between levels of integration. Improving this indicator takes on additional importance, given that the integration of the Title II program into the Mission's portfolio is one of the prerequisites for redelegation of Title II development program authority to the field.

Missions assess M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs. (Indicator 2.2.2b)

More than three-quarters of Missions with food security-related strategic objectives assess that the CS's Title II development activity indicators meet the Mission's reporting need and several Missions have made concerted efforts to integrate indicators and reporting systems into the Mission results reporting process. For example, the integration of resources by USAID/Peru (highlighted above), encourages standardized reporting across CS and in FY 1998, USAID/Peru plans to continue its work with the CSs to refine generic and/or CS-specific, higher-level indicators that will more closely track impact. USAID/Peru's SO#2, which includes its Title II activities, is currently adjusting its own indicators to better reflect the generic contributions of the Title II activities and what they can reasonably measure and support.

While the integration of CSs reporting into Mission reporting is key, it can result in increased data needs and expenses for the CS, due to the level of sophistication of the M&E plans of some Missions. It is important that the funds necessary to support these increased information requirements be made available through a combination of ISG, 202 (e) and increased monetization. In the absence of these additional resources, it may not be realistic to set targets for IR Indicator 2.2.2b that are much higher than the current baseline of 76 percent.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER DONORS (IR2.2.3)

Joint United States and European Union (U.S.-EU) food security strategies. (Indicator 2.2.3a)

The United States and the European Union, the world's two largest food aid donors, agreed to promote the development of national food security strategies in five countries (**Ethiopia**, **Eritrea**, **Malawi**, **Bolivia**, and **Angola**), in order to rationalize the use of food aid in those countries, and maximize the possibilities for long-term food security benefits. With U.S. and EU support, both **Ethiopia** and **Bolivia** completed and published food security strategies in FY 1997, thus exceeding the FY 1997 target by two. **Malawi** has completed the food security assessment that forms the basis of the strategy, and is on track to meeting the targeted date of FY 1998.

However, the unique situations in the two remaining countries, **Eritrea** and **Angola**, have impeded food security coordination. In late 1997, the U.S. and the EU identified two additional countries, **Bangladesh** and **Haiti**, as good candidates for the collaboration on food security during FY 1998, so the FY 1998 target of five will not change. The US and the EU remain hopeful that the political situation in **Angola** will improve so as to permit a focus on food security by FY 2000. The U.S. and the EU remain open to further expansion of country-specific collaboration on food assistance within the context of enhancing food security.

Joint CS and World Food Program (WFP) food security strategies. (Indicator 2.2.3b)

No joint CS-WFP food security strategies were programmed for development during FY 1997, though a consultative and participatory process is underway in **India** and **Bangladesh** that should lead to joint CS-WFP strategies and programming during FY 1998. This will contribute to maximizing efficiency in the use of Title II food aid resources by CSs and WFP. At this time, however, these are the only two countries with realistic possibilities for completing joint strategies in the coming year. Joint CS-WFP strategies in **Ethiopia** and **Haiti** have been targeted for FY 1999, and the U.S. and WFP feel confident that an additional two countries per year will be possible through FY 2001. Thus the FY 1998 target is adjusted down by one country, as are the targets for FY 1999 -2001.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES FOR INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.2 INDICATORS

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 10

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2.1a: Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess PVO has coordinated its activities and other PVO, host country, private sector and IO activities to great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of PAAs	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Mission comments on PAAs	**1997**	**baseline year**	**96%**
	1998	**TBD**	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	**1999**	**TBD**	
	2000	**TBD**	
Comments: FY 97 is baseline. The SO2 team expects to revise this indicator during FY 1998 to develop a more sensitive measure of the level of integration of Title II development resources with other in-country activities.	**2001**	**TBD**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 11

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2.1b: Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of countries	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: SO2 Project Officers indicate their activities with joint/coordinated M&E activities.	**1996**	**baseline year**	**0**
	1997	**3**	**4**
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	**1998**	**5**	
	1999	**7**	
Comments: Mozambique, Ethiopia, Bolivia and Peru established joint/coordinated M&E systems in FY 97.	**2000**	**9**	
	2001	**10**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 12

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2.2a: Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO activities contribute to Mission objectives to a great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of DAPs and PAAs	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Mission comments on DAPs and PAAs	**1997**	**baseline year**	**89%**
	1998	**TBD**	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	**1999**	**TBD**	
	2000	**TBD**	
Comments: Given already high levels reported at baseline, this indicator may be modified during FY 1998 to be a more sensitive measure of integration of Title II resources with other Mission resources.	**2001**	**TBD**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 13

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2.2b: Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs to great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of DAPs and PAAs	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Mission comments on DAPs and PAAs	**1997**	**baseline year**	**76%**
	1998	**TBD**	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	**1999**	**TBD**	
	2000	**TBD**	
Comments: FY 97 is baseline from which targets will be established for subsequent years, depending on level of resources obtained.	**2001**	**TBD**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 14

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food For Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2.3a: Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of countries (cumulative)	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Strategy documents filed in FFP SO2 Team files. Reports from the US Representative to the EU.	**1996**	**(baseline year)**	**0**
	1997	**0**	**2**
Indicator Definition: (As stated above)	**1998**	**5**	
	1999	**5 (7)***	
Comments: *(Original targets in parentheses.)	**2000**	**7 (9)**	
	2001	**10 (10)**	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 15

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: 07/31/97 **Organization:** BHR/Food For Peace			
Performance Indicator 2.2.3b: Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of countries (cumulative)	**Year**	**Planned**	**Actual**
Data Source: Strategy documents filed in FFP SO2 Team files. Reports from the US Representative to WFP.	**1996**	**(baseline year)**	**0**
	1997	**0**	**0**
Indicator Definition: (As stated above)	**1998**	**2 (3)***	
	1999	**4 (5)**	
Comments: *(Original target in parentheses.)	**2000**	**6 (7)**	
	2001	**8 (9)**	

2. EXPECTED PROGRESS THROUGH FY 2000 AND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

Based on the current Strategic Plan and the Integration Paper recently developed by the SO2 team, the activities listed in table 3 below are components of the SO2 team's implementation plan to improve Title II development activities worldwide, with special emphasis being given during FY 1998 and FY 1999 to support the decentralization of program approval authority and associated Mission capacity-building efforts. However, as table 2 shows, many capacity building activities that strengthen Missions will benefit the CSs and FFP as well. Assuming that the resources requested to support these activities are made available, the targets discussed in Section II and presented in the Performance Data Tables are expected to be met.

Table 2. Planned capacity building activities for SO2 team and partners FY 1998-FY 2000

	USAID Missions	CSs	The SO2 team
Technical assistance on food security program design and M&E, including M&E guides, by G/PHN Linkages and follow-on project contract staff	●	●	●
Technical assistance on environmental compliance through manual and field workshops	●	●	●
Technical assistance on health and nutrition through new G/PHN FANTA cooperative agreement, including best practices identification and continuation of M&E and food security program design support	●	●	●
Issuance of revised monetization guidelines and field monetization workshops	●	●	●
Timely issuance of annual program guidance and headquarters guidelines workshop	●	●	●
Annual Washington Food Aid Manager's course	●	●	●
CBO field visits for on-the-job training and assistance	●	●	
Individualized trouble-shooting assistance by FFP CBOs for **country**	●	●	
Tailored regional food aid manager's training course(s)	●	●	
Redesign of FAMPs as checklist tools to assess Mission Title II program management capacity	●		
Encouragement of twinning/cross training exchanges between Missions	●		
Institutional Support Assistance for headquarters		●	
Section 202(e) grants for field programs		●	
Technical assistance on agriculture through encouragement of FAM working group		●	
Encouragement of twinning/training exchanges between CSs		●	
FFP Procedures manual			●
Child Survival fellow			●

3. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CLOSEOUT AND GRADUATION PROGRAMS
Not applicable to BHR

4. INTEGRATED STRATEGIC PLANS
Not applicable to BHR

5. PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES
See appropriate sections of Performance Review.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE (22 CFR 216 -- IEES AND EAS)

Beginning this year, PVOs implementing Title II development activities are required to conduct an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) or Request for a Categorical Exclusion (CE), in accordance with USAID environmental review procedures, Reg. 216. For those activities determined, based on the IEE, to have potentially significant impacts on the environment, a more detailed Environmental Assessment may be required. FFP is monitoring compliance with these regulations, with the assistance of our Bureau Environmental Officer, on loan part-time from the Global Bureau.

The SO2 team, with support from the Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development, has also developed guidance for Title II PVOs to use in carrying out IEEs which will be submitted with DAPs beginning this year. The SO2 team has also supported the funding of one headquarters and four field workshops in FY 1998 that are being hosted by Title II CSs, and providing training in Title II environmental review.

PART III. STATUS OF MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

The FY 1999 Management Contract between the SO2 Team and BHR Management has been hindered by the fact that the Team has not received the increased resources requested last year and little guidance has been provided on how to identify and eliminate lower-priority actions.

Thus, in this R4, the SO2 Team reiterates the need for Bureau management to reexamine staff and financial resources provided to the Team, and if the requested resources cannot be provided, to work with the team in deciding which of the following two strategies is more appropriate:

a) Scaling-back of the SO2 Team's Strategic Plan, including its managing for results and focused institutional strengthening efforts. Under this scenario, FFP would only assume responsibility for commodities and financial oversight of Title II development activities; or

b) "Minimalist" management of the funds allocated annually to the SO2 team, meaning slow responsiveness to requests for funding, limited travel to Missions and Title II field sites, and continuing customer dissatisfaction.

It is important to note that the way the SO2 Team's strategic plan is developed, it is difficult to link dollar levels provided to Intermediate Results, given the strong political and humanitarian constituencies supporting full programming of the Title II resources appropriated annually to USAID. Consequently, the two choices outlined above are the only realistic options for the team's consideration.

PART IV. RESOURCE REQUEST

For FY 1998 Congress provided USAID with $3.3 billion in discretionary programmatic resources, of which 25 percent was appropriated for Title II and Title III commodities ($837 million and $30 million, respectively). Although food aid accounts for one-quarter of the Agency's discretionary budget, the Office of Food For Peace employs less than 1 percent of the Agency's direct hire staff and receives far less than 1 percent of the Agency's Development Assistance (DA) resources -- dollar funds that are critical to provide our PVO/NGO Cooperating Sponsors (CSs) with training and technical assistance, as well as grants to complement their food aid resources and make their Title II development activities truly effective and sustainable. Such grant funds are used by PVOs to hire and train staff, procure equipment and supplies, provide training and technical assistance to their in-country local counterparts, as well as design, manage, monitor and evaluate their activities.

As a result of this continual underfunding of the Office of Food for Peace and its PVO counterparts, BHR/FFP has become increasingly vulnerable to criticism from the U.S. General Accounting Office, which in 1993 and 1995 criticized USAID's failure to ensure accountability for food aid resources and inability to demonstrate the impact of food aid on food security; as well as by USAID's Office of the Inspector General, which stated in a 1997 report that "BHR/FFP's management structure is not adequate to ensure that food aid is targeted to the most needy people."

Despite inadequate funds and limited staff, over the last three years, BHR/FFP has, nonetheless, worked hard at addressing GAO's and IG's concerns. Some progress has been made, as demonstrated in the performance tables presented in this report, and include: an improvement in the technical quality of proposals and monitoring reports submitted by CSs to the SO2 team; an enhanced commitment to and capability among the CSs to manage for results, as well as design programs that enhance food security and/or household nutrition; and an increased integration of PVO development programs into Mission's strategic plans. Additionally, beginning in FY 1998, Title II development partners will be required to meet the Agency-mandated Environmental Compliance Regulation 216 -- to ensure that food aid activities cause no negative environmental consequences and where feasible, actually enhance the natural resource base. Compliance with USAID Reg. 216 will require that CSs carry out environmental reviews of their activities and develop appropriate mitigation plans to minimize or eliminate any negative environmental impacts.

Where the SO2 Team has made progress, it has benefitted from the commitments and efforts of CSs, as well as through modest buy-ins into Global/Health and Nutrition (G/PHN/HN) and G/Environment (G/ENV) technical contracts, and financial and/or staff contributions from other USAID offices and bureaus, including G/HN, G/ENV, AFR/SD, and BHR/PVC. Although these offices have supported the technical strengthening and transformation of FFP, they are all offices with limited staff and resources whose voluntary contributions to FFP will not continue indefinitely, and in several cases, have started to wane.

In the three years since FFP raised the standards by which it approves funding for food aid proposals, the Office has seen improvement in the quality of PVO programs. Unfortunately, they have not come without a high cost. First, because only one new staff position has been authorized since 1990 for food aid development activities and so much of FFP's staff time is increasingly invested in the technical review and approval of food aid proposals, there is less time to focus on the

financial, programmatic and administrative management of on-going food aid activities. Additionally, management responsibilities of FFP have grown as Missions downsize, CSs initiate activities in countries without USAID Missions (or non-presence countries), and new Agency initiatives begin, such as the GHAI, the African Education Initiative and the Transatlantic Agenda. As a result of these increased demands, and as evidenced under Intermediate Result One, the Office is presently unable to consistently respond in a timely manner to requests for support; keep up to date on activity implementation and review of required reporting; as well as track and report fully on results. Consequently, customer satisfaction is decreasing.

Moreover, Cooperating Sponsors who have received minimal additional funding, TA and training from BHR/FFP, are now expected to use their limited FFP-provided dollar grants to meet an ever-growing set of costly technical and programmatic requirements. These new requirements necessitate that PVOs hire technically trained sectoral, M&E and environmental staff and consultants for PVO headquarters and/or field sites; carry out baseline surveys, midterm and final evaluations, as well as environmental reviews; and provide adequate TA, training and backstopping to CS field sites to ensure that activities are on track and technical concerns are being addressed. As a result CSs have increasingly expressing their concerns to BHR/FFP that they cannot keep doing more with less; and if they are required to meet higher Title II design, approval, and performance monitoring and reporting standards, they require additional funding.

To avoid having to make the choice described in Part III above, the SO2 team is requesting the following staff, OE and dollar assistance increases:

OE: From $118,000 to $148,000

Staff levels: From 7 to 10 positions in FFP/DP (or from 14 to 17 for SO2 team)

DA: From $3.29 million in FY 1998 to $6.3 million in FY 2000

The sections below describe in more detail exactly what is being requesting in workforce, OE and DA resources that are needed to achieve Strategic Objective 2 and the associated Intermediate Results. A summary of P.L. 480 food aid and 202(e) resources needed by Title II PVOs and Missions to achieve their results is also provided, and a consolidated FFP budget is provided in a separate document.

A. Workforce Requirements

Currently, the SO2 Team has only five Country Backstop Officers supporting 60 activities in 23 countries, and administering over $391.5 million in Title II resources. This is an average of about 15 activities, 6 countries and $78.3 million per officer, and represents an increase of 7 activities since FY 1996. If all 14 positions supporting SO2, which includes management, program operations, and administrative staff are considered, the average employee is supporting a $28 million budget -- still inadequate.

A comparison of BHR/FFP/DP with other BHR offices managing development activities through PVOs/NGOs indicates that the other offices have a stronger staff to funding levels than FFP/DP, as indicated in the table below:

Table 3. FFP SO2 Staff to Program Ratios in Comparison With Other Offices Managing Development Assistance Programs -- Figures Based on FY 1998 Approved Levels in Budget Documents

Office/Agency	Program Level $ Millions	Positions
BHR/FFP/DP	$391.5	14
BHR/PVC	$47.2	19
BHR/ASHA	$15.0	5

(Based on approved FY 1998 Staffing Levels in USAID/W. Also, for FFP/DP, all Title II development activities plus ISG and 202(e) grants are considered as "grants" for purposes of this comparison.)

The above table demonstrates that of the three BHR development offices listed, FFP/DP (represented as the SO2 Team) has the most unfavorable program level to staff ratio:

Office	**$ Millions Per Staff Member**
BHR/FFP/DP	$27.9
BHR/PVC	$ 2.5
BHR/ASHA	$ 3.0

It is also important to note that the level of management oversight needed in FFP/DP may be higher than in other parts of the Bureau and Agency due to the following: that food security is a poorly understood, complex, multi-sectoral field that requires unique development skills; FFP does its own grant making (rather than relying on M/OP); and food aid management requires unique skills in commodity procurement, transport and agricultural market analysis.

Not only is the work load to staff ratio high and of growing complexity, but the SO2 Team's ability to adequately manage its resources is being further jeopardized by the following:

- P.L. 480 Legislation allows Title II PVOs to work in non-USAID presence countries. These programs must be managed from Washington by the SO2 team and currently include activities in Chad, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea- Bissau and Mauritania. Activities in non-presence countries are also expected to increase as FFP encourages CSs to "grow" the Title II development program in sub-Saharan Africa;

- because most Missions are being downsized and do not have adequate staff to backstop Title II activities, many are increasingly turning to FFP and Offices in Washington for support in managing food aid. Additionally, a number of Missions in food-insecure countries in Africa are reluctant to consider development of new Title II activities in their countries unless FFP assumes more management responsibility;

- several countries, including Angola, Rwanda, Liberia and possibly Bosnia are expected to soon transition from emergency to development programs; and

- as the Greater Horn of Africa (GHAI) Initiative, the Africa Education Initiative and the Transatlantic Initiative become operationalized, the SO2 Team's workload will increase.

This past year the SO2 team has experienced increased staff turnover. This exacerbates the management burden, as extensive training is required to bring new staff up to speed on the programmatic issues unique to food aid. Furthermore, it is noted that lesser numbers of FSOs are bidding on FFP/W assignments.

To adequately address the critical problems above and for SO2 to effectively manage its Title II resources and achieve the results in its Strategic Plan, the Team clearly needs an increased number of direct hire staff. Therefore, (as summarized in Budget Table 1) FFP is requesting three new project officers to work full time on SO2. As currently envisioned, the three new full-time project officers needed are:

(1) Two country backstop officers to assume responsibility for activities in both new transition countries (Angola, Liberia, Bosnia, Rwanda) and non-presence countries (including Burkina Faso, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Chad, Mauritania, et.al.,) where higher levels of support and extensive travel are required;

(2) A country backstop officer to assume responsibility for activities in up to three countries, as well as serve as the Office's technical assistance and training coordinator, serving as a liaison with the technical offices in the Global Bureau (Health/Nutrition, AG/Food Security, and Environment) whose contracts FFP/DP plan to buy into for technical support. This person should also have expertise in monitoring and evaluation, which will continue to be a critical focus of the SO2 Team's institutional strengthening support.

Note that the SO2 Team is not requesting the addition of a Health and Nutrition Officer this year, as it did in last year's R4. This is because, beginning in FY 1998, the Team will be accessing such support through the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Child Survival Fellowship program, using DA funding. Given that the SO2 Team allocates half its budget and over $160 million of food aid annually to support programs in maternal and child health and water and sanitation, the addition of a full-time JHU fellow for SO2 beginning in FY 1999 is critical. This request is included in the DA portion of this resource request document.

If the workforce requirements cannot be met through increased direct-hire FTEs, it is strongly requested that alternative options be authorized (e.g., IDIs, PMIs, AAAS Fellows), PSCs (and PSC hiring authority for development programs), with a requisite level of funding.

B. Operating Expense (Non-Personnel) Requirements

In addition to the workforce requirements described above, the SO2 Team requests an increase in the level of OE funds for travel and support services. Additional travel funds will be needed by the SO2 team as the Office assumes responsibility for more activities in non-presence countries and those with limited Mission capacity, as the GHAI and Africa Education Initiative are operationalized, as several programs transition from emergency to development, and as Title II managed growth activities in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are pursued.

The SO2 Team has estimated that a total of $148,000 is required for travel and support services in both FY 1999 and FY 2000. A breakdown of the required travel and support services funding requirements is summarized in Budget Table 1 below:

Budget Table 1: Operating Expense Requirements

Operating Expense		**(Thousands of Dollars)**		
		FY 1998 Act	**FY 1999 Req.**	**FY 2000 Req.**
Travel				
1.	Travel for site visits, reviews and evaluations	$85.00	$100.00	$100.00
2.	Travel to conferences and BHR/FFP field workshops	$15.00	$30.00	$30.00
Travel Subtotal:		**$100.00**	**$130.00**	**$130.00**
Services				
3.a	Management & Professional Services	$15.00	$15.00	$15.00
3.b	Supplies and Services	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
Services Subtotal:		**$18.00**	**$18.00**	**$18.00**
TOTAL NON-PERSONNEL OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET:		**$118.00**	**$148.00**	**$148.00**

Specifically, the line items in Budget Table 1 would be used for:

(1) travel for site visits, to participate in DAP and PAA reviews, to provide technical assistance to Mission and CS partners, and to backstop activities in "non-presence" countries. Additionally, because many Title II development activities are due for mid-term and final evaluations in the

next few years, increased travel funds are needed in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to allow adequate FFP participation on the evaluation teams. This is critical for assessing the effectiveness and impact of Title II activities, and for determining the influence of monitoring for results on FFP's development programs;

(2) travel to international conferences and workshops to: (1) increase coordination with other donors and (2) conduct two food aid manager training workshops in the field, one in Latin America and one in Africa; and

(3) management supplies and services for computer hardware and software -- this is critical for maintaining FFP's information system for tracking P.L.480 commodities, since it is separate from the Agency's computer system and support, and not part of the New Management System (NMS).

C. Development Assistance (DA) Resource Requirements

The Office of Food For Peace currently receives $6 million of DA resources to support an $857 million food aid budget for FY 1998. This is equivalent to about $7,000 of cash to support the design and implementation of every $1 million of food -- not a realistic level to effectively manage resources and demonstrate results. Although some progress has been made in strengthening the review, approval and design of developmental food aid programs, much more needs to be done, as described in the following sections.

As part of its DA request, the SO2 team requests an increased allocation of USAID Child Survival and Micronutrient funds to meet our dollar-supported requirements, since 47 percent of our food aid programs support maternal and child health and nutrition activities. The Office plans to pursue this with both the Global and Management Bureaus.

Overview of DA-Supported Activities for SO2:

Budget Table 2: Development Assistance Requirements

Development Assistance Type	(Thousands of Dollars)		
	Actual FY 1998	**Request FY 1999 (per CP)**	**Request FY 2000**
1. FFP Institutional and Administrative Support Contract	$800.00	$800.00	**$800.00**
2. Institutional Support Agreements	$2,163.10	$2,188.46	**$4,300.00**
3. Technical Assistance and Training /a	$450.00	$450.00	**$1050.00**
4. Child Survival Fellow	$154.90	$161.54	**$150.00**
5. Other	$32.00		
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	$3,600.00	$3,600.00	**$6,300.00**

(1) **FFP Institutional Support Contract**

Technical support to the SO2 Team, which is currently provided through a contract with Mendez England & Associates, is critically needed for assistance in a number of administrative and information services, including commodity and logistics tracking, information system management, assistance in administering grant programs and organizing program reviews, and organization of conferences and training workshops such as the Food Aid Managers Course offered annually for USAID Washington and field staff.

(2) **Institutional Support Assistance (ISAs)**

Institutional Support Assistance (previously called Institutional Support Grants) are a key resource for providing our implementing partners with the necessary dollar resources to achieve the following:

a) Strengthen CS headquarters and/or regional-level institutional and technical capacity to design and manage technically sound and appropriate food aid interventions; to manage for results; to account for Title II commodities; and to better design, target and manage food aid activities. This includes building the capacity of PVOs to develop monitoring and evaluation systems; to conduct Bellmon analyses and manage commodity monetizations; to design technically appropriate and sound sectoral activities that have a demonstrable impact on enhanced food security; and to adapt and test methodologies or tools to transition from emergency to development programs.

b) Improve collaboration among CSs implementing Title II activities, and between CSs and Missions doing integrated programming in specific countries. This includes encouraging CS partners to jointly develop or improve tools, methodologies, expertise and monitoring and evaluation systems; fostering collaboration and joint planning between CSs and Missions, international organizations and other donors, including integration of non-food resources; and encouraging mentoring of smaller CSs by larger, more experienced organizations;

c) Conduct needs assessments and design programs in new countries or regions where the CS is not currently implementing activities, particularly in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa; and develop innovative approaches to initiate new activities in least developed (LDC) countries and low-income, food deficit countries (LIFDCs); and

d) Support a food aid coordinating/collaborative body representing the Title II Cooperating Sponsors.

Current Funding of ISAs

For FY 1998, BHR is providing FFP with $3.5 million to support the ISAs for all Title II CSs, both on the development and emergency side, of which the SO2 team is expected to receive $2 million. Because this level is inadequate, FFP plans to use $1.5 million of its 202(e) funds to support ISA requests, bringing the Office total to $5 million. FFP expects to receive up to 20 CS proposals for ISA support in FY 1998.

It is also important to note that the limited availability of ISA resources may hamper the ability of PVOs to design new food aid development activities, since design of new initiatives requires an extensive investment of staff time, travel funds and technical analyses that are critical to assess a host country's food security problems and propose appropriate interventions to address them.

Based on the current high demand for ISA resources and their critical link to achievement of the SO2 Team's achievement of its strategic objective, the Team requests that no less than $4.3 million be allocated annually for development food aid activity purposes, and no less than $6 million (rather than the current $3.5 million) be provided annually to BHR/FFP to support both SO1 and SO2.

(3) **Technical Assistance and Training**

Over the last three years the SO2 Team has been accessing a modest level of technical assistance from the Global Bureau's Office of Health and Nutrition, initially through the IMPACT project and now through LINKAGES. For FY 1998, the SO2 team is procuring approximately $350,000 of support through G/HN, and $500,000 is being procured by FFP for SO1 and SO2 combined. The Global Bureau has also provided some matching funds to this effort, given our limited resources and G/HN's desire to assist FFP in its efforts to strengthen the food security and nutritional impact of food aid.

Our support from Global/PHN/HN has focused primarily on assisting BHR/FFP in the review of proposals, results reports and evaluation plans, with the ultimate aim of enhancing the food security focus of Title II development activities, and ensuring that CSs are managing for results through detailed monitoring and evaluation systems developed during activity design. In this role, the technical support contractor can be credited for many of the significant improvements shown in CS proposals and report submissions over the last few years.

Despite the significant progress achieved with IMPACT and LINKAGEs Project support, there are major technical assistance and training needs of FFP, the Missions and the PVOs that go beyond the current focus of monitoring and evaluation, and that cannot be procured with our present contribution. It is clear how little funding this is when one compares the TA and training provided by FFP with its sister office in BHR/PVC/CSH (Child Survival and Health). Although the two offices fund some similar maternal and child health activities, BHR/FFP (SO1 and SO2 combined) procures $500,000 worth of technical assistance annually to support an $860 million program. In comparison, BHR/PVC/CSH procures approximately $1.5 million of TA annually to support a grants program that averages $15 to $20 million per year.

Although BHR/FFP does not propose a level of DA funds to provide technical support comparable to that provided by BHR/PVC/CSH, there are critical needs that must be met if the Office is to realize its strategic plan. These needs were recently revealed in a survey of Title II Missions and CSs and are identified as follows (note they are not presented in order of priority):

a) CSs are in need of support in problem analysis, program design and strategic planning, particularly as it relates to the unique, cross-sectoral nature of food security programming. Such expertise needs to be built up at CS headquarters and field offices.

b) CSs are seeking concrete guidance and access to tested models on many food aid-specific activities, including commodity and ration selection, Bellmon determinations, weaning foods and beneficiary targeting. Operations research will need to be carried out to develop models and protocols in some of these areas.

c) Missions are interested in accessing support in food security strategic planning and program integration, in seeing a more formal structure to food security/food aid programming; and in seeing greater synergy between programs in health, nutrition, agriculture and income generation -- all sectoral programs that affect food security.

d) BHR/FFP, Missions and CSs require on going access to expertise in monitoring and evaluation (M&E), including a review of the relevance and application of food security monitoring and impact indicators developed thus far, an assessment of existing M&E tools that are easy to use in PVO-type programs, field testing of the indicator guides developed under the IMPACT Project, and examination of appropriate qualitative indicators for food security programs. Additionally, there is further work required on development of indicators in Natural Resource Management (NRM), Micro-enterprise, Education and institutional strengthening.

e) BHR/FFP needs greater access to technical expertise in the review of CS proposals, Results Reports, Bellmon Analyses and Monetization plans, as well as Mission strategic plan and R4s, and other required documents. Although technical support is sometimes available within the Agency for Title II proposal reviews, Agency participation in our review processes is irregular.

f) BHR/FFP requires greater assistance in: (a) improving linkages between relief and development; and (b) developing long-term strategies (internally and with other donors) for food security programming in critical regions, such as the Greater Horn of Africa and the Sahel.

g) FFP, Missions and CSs need technical assistance and training to support their compliance with USAID Regulation 216 to ensure that Title II development activities cause no negative environmental consequences and where feasible, actually enhance the natural resource base.

In order to address the broad technical assistance and training needs described above, FFP proposes to access assistance through the following Global Bureau contract mechanisms in FY 2000, with the levels proposed:

a) **New Global/HN Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) Project.**

This new project under design will be a follow-on to the IMPACT contract and provide technical assistance to food security-related programs that deal with household-level nutrition. However, it will go beyond IMPACT in that it will not only focus on monitoring and evaluation, but on aspects of activity design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The Global Bureau also plans to provide a significant level of funds to this project to support operations research and development of protocols that support food aid programming in such areas as selection of appropriate commodities, rations and weaning foods.

SO2 FY 2000 Request for FANTA buy-in: $775,000

b) **Global/Ag and Food Security Cooperative Agreement with Michigan State University Food Security II Project; and possibly other agriculture support mechanisms to be identified**.

Beginning in FY 1998 the SO2 team proposes a modest buy-in of $50,000 to the MSU Cooperative agreement to provide TA and training to FFP, Missions and PVOs in addressing agricultural marketing and targeting issues, that may include: improved targeting of food aid to reach the most chronically food-insecure populations in selected Sub-Saharan African Countries and regions; enhanced capacity in carrying out Bellmon Analyses to avoid the disincentive effects of food assistance on local agricultural production and market disruptions; linkage of cooperating sponsors to decentralized agricultural marketing information systems; and development of strategies to better link relief and development programs. However, given the possibility that the MSU Cooperative Agreement cannot meet all the agricultural technical assistance needs identified by FFP, additional mechanisms may be identified at a later date.

SO2 FY 2000 Request for Agricultural TA: $200,000

c) **Global/Environment Contract with EPIQ**

For the next several years BHR/FFP/DP plans to continue accessing support from Global's EPIQ project to provide technical assistance and training to CSs in environmental review and compliance. Such support is particularly critical for the Title II development program since it supports many activities that have potential environmental consequences, including development of roads, irrigation schemes and other types of infrastructure, agricultural production and natural resource management, and building of latrines and sanitation facilities. All CSs implementing such activities are required to carry out environmental reviews and develop appropriate mitigation measures to ensure their activities do not result in negative environmental consequences. Extensive training is being held in FY 1998 to prepare CSs for this process, but some level of additional support will undoubtedly be needed in FY 1999 and FY 2000.

SO2 FY 2000 Request for EPIQ buy-in: $ 75,000

Consequences of not receiving requested DA funding levels

The Office could not carry out its daily operations and program food aid without the critical input of the Mendez England support contract, and thus, funding of this contract will remain its first priority with the DA funds made available.

If DA resources are not provided to support the requested increase in ISA grant levels and technical assistance and training, the ability of Title II development activities to achieve and demonstrate impact will be severely curtailed, along with the ability of the SO2 Team to achieve its Strategic Plan.

D. Section 202(e) Grants -- Resource Request

Through the Title II funds appropriated yearly in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (P.L. 480), as amended, $28 million is awarded under Section 202(e) to support the field operations of food aid programs. $10 million of these funds are "earmarked" for the World Food Programme and the remaining $18 million are used to support development and emergency food aid activities.

In FY 1998 BHR plans to award up to $11.2 million of these 202(e) funds for development activities. Although not all Title II development activities receive 202(e) funds and some have access to local currency through the monetization of commodities and other contributions (e.g. host country transport of commodities), it is safe to say that the average Title II development activity receives approximately $186,000 per year to support its field operations -- to cover CS staff salaries and expenses, travel, training and technical assistance, procurement of vehicles and equipment, commodity and financial management, activity monitoring and evaluation, overhead, and other critical field operations associated with food aid management. This amount is judged to be insufficient.

Therefore, BHR/FFP requests that the level of 202(e) grant funds available to SO2 be increased to $33 million a year and the total level for BHR/FFP be increased from $28 million to $50 million. This increase is needed to support BHR's goals of managed growth of Title II development programs and the heightened technical focus associated with managing for results.

In order to seek to augment the section 202(e) authorization to $50 million, USAID will need to closely co-ordinate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA/FAS) to ensure that this enhanced funding is added into the next P.L. 480 appropriations request.

E. Prioritization of Objectives

The SO2 Team believes that to achieve sustainable results from Title II activities in eliminating food insecurity, it is critical to enhance the integration of Title II with Mission strategies, development assistance funds and other donor/NGO resources. Therefore, in prioritizing resources allocated to its partners, integrated approaches will receive priority over "stand alone" activities.

With respect to the OE and DA resources available to the SO2 Team for increasing the effectiveness of its partners, as stated earlier, if additional resources are not provided, the Office will face the stark choice of: (1) "minimalist" management by BHR/FFP and the CSs of the $320 to $400 million allocated annually for development food aid activities -- the present situation; or (2) dilution of SO2's strategic planning and monitoring for results efforts.

F. Performance Weights and Measures

Just as the Agency is seeking to improve the process of DA allocation to better link resources to results and priorities, FFP is also seeking to improve the process by which it allocates Title II resources through more rigorous reviews of DAPs and PAAs. Consequently, DAP/PAA guidance includes explicit criteria by which proposals are approved and resources are allocated. These review criteria act as "weights and measures" linking Title II allocation with results and USAID priorities. The SO2 team consequently applies a 100% weight to performance (in meeting our review criteria and food security objective) and thus does not use the Agency's other criteria, such as "U.S. National Interest, Quality of the Development Partnership with the Host Country", etc.

As part of the DAP/PAA review process, performance targets are established by PVOs and are a basis for continued food aid assistance. This review process functions similarly to the Agency weights and measures in that proposals are judged by: (1) the performance of activities against planned targets; (2) the extent to which they support P.L. 480's development goal of improved food security; and (3) the links between activities and development initiatives of host country institutions, USAID Missions, other PVOs and other donors.

u:\ffpdp\docs\so2r4.00

Appendix Table 1: Approved FY 1998 CS-Implemented Title II Development Activities (as of 5/8/1998 - excluding WFP)

No.	Region	Country/Sponsor	LOA	Title II (Estimated)		202(e)****	Types of Components							
				Tons	$	$	HN	WS	AG	NR	ED	HA	RI	ME
1.	Africa	Benin/CRS	96-00	4649	$2,131,100	$290,221	X					X		
2.	Africa	Burkina Faso/CRS	97-01	18483	$10,632,500	$134,548					X	X		
3.	Africa	Cape Verde/ACDI	97-01	11228	$3,447,100	$400,680	X		X					
4.	Africa	Chad/Mali/Africare*	97-01	0	0.00	$396,018	X		X					
5.	Africa	Eritrea/Africare	95-97	430	$422,300	$52,818			X					
6.	Africa	Ethiopia/CARE	97-01	9100	$5,746,900	$577,280	X	X	X	X				
7.	Africa	Ethiopia/CRS	97-01	22118	$12,684,500	$337,185	X		X		X	X		
8.	Africa	Ethiopia/FHI**	96-98	3785	$2,159,200	0.00	X	X	X	X				
9.	Africa	Ethiopia/EOC**	98-02	1808	$1,531,100	0.00			X					
10.	Africa	Ethiopia/REST**	96-98	10784	$5,013,800	0.00			X	X				
11.	Africa	Ethiopia/SCF	96-98	3446	$3,144,200	$50,000	X	X	X					
12.	Africa	Ethiopia/WVRD	95-97	2750	$1,413,800	$77,040	X		X					X
13.	Africa	Gambia/CRS	97-01	3108	$1,826,900	0.00	X		X					
14.	Africa	Ghana/ADRA	97-01	16900	$4,337,100	$379,730	X		X					
15.	Africa	Ghana/CRS	97-01	13839	$5,205,500	$26,530	X				X	X		
16.	Africa	Ghana/TechnoServe	97-01	16900	$4,377,100	0.00			X					
17.	Africa	Guinea/Africare	96-00	0.00	0.00	$233,103	X		X					
18.	Africa	Guinea/OICI *, **	96-00	0.00	0.00	0.00			X					X
19.	Africa	GuineaBiss/Africare*	95-98	0.00	0.00	$197,728	X		X					
20.	Africa	Kenya/ADRA	98-02	650	$244,400	$168,000		X	X					
21.	Africa	Kenya/CARE	98-02	1160	$436,200	0.00		X	X					X
22.	Africa	Kenya/FHI	98-02	570	$214,300	$88,000	X		X					
23.	Africa	Kenya/CRS	97-00	1140	$428,600	0.00	X	X	X					
24.	Africa	Kenya/TechnoServe	98-01	510	$191,800	$101,107			X					
25.	Africa	Kenya/WVRD	97-00	970	$364,700	$24,194			X					
26.	Africa	Madagascar/ADRA	98-02	1750	$1,148,000	$266,586			X			X		
27.	Africa	Madagascar/CARE	98-02	1280	$839,700	$146,959		X				X		
28.	Africa	Madagascar/CRS	95-98	6906	$3,661,800	0.00	X					X		
29.	Africa	Mauritania/Doulos**	96-00	1688	$895,900	$11,000	X					X		
30.	Africa	Mozambique/ADRA	97-01	7560	$1,958,000	$130,529	X		X					
31.	Africa	Mozambique/Africare	97-01	4460	$1,155,100	$142,713	X		X					
32.	Africa	Mozambique/CARE*	97-01	9940	$2,574,500	$192,903	X		X					
33.	Africa	Mozambique/FHI*, **	97-01	7550	$1,955,500	0.00	X		X					
34.	Africa	Mozambique/SCF	97-01	5040	$1,305,400	$176,501	X		X					
35.	Africa	Mozambique/WVRD*	97-01	24660	$9,959,900	$739,247	X		X					
36.	Africa	Uganda/ACDI	97-01	4000	$4,328,000	$281,654			X					
37.	Africa	Uganda/Africare	97-01	3570	$1,281,600	$177,926			X					
AFRICA SUBTOTAL				222732	$97,016,500	$5,800,200								

HN= health/nutrition; WS= water/sanitation; AG= agriculture; NR= natural resources; ED= education; HA= humanitarian assistance; RI= roads/infrastructure.; ME= microenterprise

Appendix Table 1 cont.: ***Approved FY 1998 CS-Implemented Title II Development Activities (as of 5/8/1998 - excluding WFP)***

No.	Region	Country/Sponsor	LOA	Title II (Estimated)		202(e)****	Types of Components							
				Tons	$	$	HN	WS	AG	NR	ED	HA	RI	M
38.	Asia	Bangladesh/CARE	94-99	80000	$20,720,000	0.00			X					
39.	Asia	India/CARE**	97-01	146254	$74,159,400	$244,399	X							
40.	Asia	India/CRS	97-01	49601	21,137,000	$1,623,540	X		X		X	X		
ASIA SUBTOTAL				275855	116,016,400	$1,867,939								
41.	LAC	Bolivia/ADRA	97-01	15992	$7,879,700	$338,328	X	X	X		X			
42.	LAC	Bolivia/FHI	97-01	9043	$4,312,900	$278,123	X	X	X		X			
43.	LAC	Bolivia/PCI	97-01	10700	$5,188,400	$351,945	X	X	X		X			
44.	LAC	Guatemala/CARE	96-00	12279	$5,639,500	$159,300	X	X				X		
45.	LAC	Guatemala/CRS	97-01	13945	$6,271,800	$100,431	X		X			X		X
46.	LAC	Guatemala/FTC**	97-01	822	$380,500	0.00						X		
47.	LAC	Guatemala/SHARE	96-00	6331	$3,261,200	$199,285	X					X		
48.	LAC	Haiti/ADRA*	96-00	16836	$7,417,900	$250,000	X		X		X	X		
49.	LAC	Haiti/CARE*	96-00	18984	$8,346,500	$33,750	X	X		X		X		
50.	LAC	Haiti/CRS*	96-00	15331	$6,827,300	0.00	X				X	X		
51.	LAC	Honduras/CARE	96-00	11399	$4,481,700	$220,599	X		X			X		
52.	LAC	Nicaragua/ADRA	96-00	1054	$551,100	$231,250	X							
53.	LAC	Nicaragua/PCI	97-01	1278	$661,800	$143,423	X							
54.	LAC	Nicaragua/SCF	96-00	1290	$667,200	$285,102	X							
55.	LAC	Peru/ADRA	96-00	16020	$8,900,500	$246,278	X		X					
56.	LAC	Peru/CARE	96-00	28077	$16,256,400	0.00	X		X					
57.	LAC	Peru/Caritas**	96-00	25006	$12,893,100	0.00	X		X			X		
58.	LAC	Peru/PRISMA**	96-00	21466	$12,085,400	0.00	X		X			X		
59.	LAC	Peru/Technoserve	98-02	3400	$2,230,400	0.00			X					
LAC SUBTOTAL				229253	$114,253,300	$2,837,814								
TOTAL APPROVED:				727840	$327,286,200	$10,505,953								

HN= health/nutrition; WS= water/sanitation; AG= agriculture; NR= natural resources; ED= education; HA= humanitarian assistance; RI= roads/infrastructure.; ME= micro-enterprise

General Note: This table was prepared to reflect approvals which are funded by FY 98 commodities and Section 202(e) funds. However, cases are noted where FY 97 commodities and/or funds were used to support FY 98 program implementation. Similarly, FY 98 funds and commodities will be used to make commodities and funds available for FY 99 programming, where warranted. Figures above (commodity tonnages and related dollar values-including transportation) are drawn from the Food for Peace Information System (FFPIS) Line 8 report as of 5/8/98 (not from Cooperating Sponsor proposals or budgets). Section 202(e) dollar figures are approved figures as of 5/8/98.

Additional Notes:

* These programs were provided FY 97 commodities for use in FY 98; FY 99 programs, when approved, may be provided FY 98 commodities.

** FY 97 Section 202(e) funds were used for grants to support FY 98 activities for these programs.

*** The "micro-enterprise" category may be under-represented because of integration into a larger program under another technical area.

**** 202(e) Recap: $10,505,953 (above total)+$70,986 (env. workshops)+$637,450 (CRS A133 grant)+$5,611(unobligated balance)= $11,220,000 (202(e) development programs budget)

RESOURCE REQUEST
FOR FY 2000 R4

BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE
OFFICE OF FOOD FOR PEACE

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES 1 & 2

BHR/FFP
Consolidated Resource Request for SO 1 and SO 2

This document contains the following information:

I Workforce requirements for SO 1 and SO 2 for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001. See Appendix A - G.

II Development Assistance Program Budget for SO 1 for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000. See Appendix H, I, and J. Development Assistance Program Budget for SO 2 for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. See Appendix K, L, and M.

III Operating Expense budget for Office of Food for Peace for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. See Appendix N.

IV P.L. 480, Title II, budget for fiscal years 1998, 1999 and 2000. See Appendix O.

Appendix A
U.S. Direct Hire Workforce Requirements - SO 1

FFP/ Division	Position Description	% of Time for SO1 Team			Position is:	
		FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	Existing	New
FFP/D	Director	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Deputy Director	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Special Assistant	50%	50%	50%	X	
FFP/D	Grants Officer	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	50%	50%	50%	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Chief	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	PA (ER Coord)	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Analyst	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Budget Analyst	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Specialist	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Assistant	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Secretary	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officer	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/ER	Chief	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officers (4)	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officers (3)	0%	100%	**100%**		X

Total Full Time Equivalency 13.0 16.0 16.0

Appendix B
US Direct Hire Workforce Requirements SO 2

FFP/ Division	Position Description	% of Time for SO2 Team			Position is:	
		FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	Existing	New
FFP/D	Director	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Deputy Director	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Special Assistant	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Grants Officer	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/DP	Chief	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officers (5)	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officers (3)	0%	100%	**100%**		X
FFP/DP	Secretary	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/POD	Chief	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Analyst	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	PA (Dev Coord)	100%	100%	**100%**	X	
FFP/POD	Budget Analyst	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Specialist	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Assistant	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
FFP/POD	Secretary	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
BHR/PPE	Prog Analyst	50%	50%	**50%**	X	
Total Full Time Equivalency		**14.5**	**17.5**	**17.5**		

Appendix C

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ FY 1998 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	13	14.5						27.5							0	27.5
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	6							6							0	6
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	19	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Appendix D

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ FY 1999 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5						33.5							0	33.5
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	8							8							0	8
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows	2	1						3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ FY 1999 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5						33.5							0	33.5
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	8							8							0	8
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows	2	1						3							0	3

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Appendix E

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ FY 2000 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5						33.5							0	33.5
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	8							8							0	8
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows	3	1						4							0	4

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ FY 2000 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5						33.5							0	33.5
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	8							8							0	8
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows	3	1						4							0	4

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Appendix F

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ FY 2001 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5						33.5							0	33.5
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program	8							8							0	8
FSN/TCN Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire:																
OE Internationally Recruited								0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited								0							0	0
Program								0							0	0
Total Staff Levels	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows	3	1						4							0	4

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Appendix G

Org.__BHR/FFP_____ Summary On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con-troller	AMS/ EXO	Con-tract	Legal	All Other		
FY 1998:																
U.S. Direct Hire	13	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	27.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.5
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	13	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	27.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.5
Program Funded	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Total FY 1998	19	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
FY 1999 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
Program Funded	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total FY 1999 Target	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
FY 1999 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
Program Funded	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total FY 1999 Request	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
FY 2000 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
Program Funded	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total FY 2000 Target	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
FY 2000 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
Program Funded	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total FY 2000 Request	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5
FY 2001 Estimate:																
U.S. Direct Hire	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total OE Funded Staf	16	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	33.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5
Program Funded	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total FY 2000 Target	24	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	41.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.5

USAID FY 2000 BUDGET REQUEST BY PROGRAM/COUNTRY Appendix H 29-Jul-98 01:20 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

SO #1 Title: Meet critical food needs of targeted vulnerable groups in emergency situations.

	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 99	Estimated Total	FY 2000 Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 00	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	DA	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	2,220	0	999	1,221	0	0		0	0	0	0	1,998		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	CD	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	1,480	370		0	0	1,110		0	0	0	0	1,332		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0									0				0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			0	3,700	370	999	1,221	0	1,110		0	0	0	0			**0**	

FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	2,220
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	370
PHN	1,110
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

Appendix I

USAID FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

29-Jul-98
01:20 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # 1 , Title: Meet critical food needs of targeted vulnerable groups in emergency situations.	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 98	Estimated Total	FY 1999 Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 99	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	DA	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	1,608	0	720	888	0	0		0	0	0	0	1,447		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	CD	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	792	192		0	0	600		0	0	0	0	713		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0									0				0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			0	2,400	192	720	888	0	600		0	0	0	0			**0**	

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	1,608
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	192
PHN	600
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country Appendix J 29-Jul-98 01:20 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # 1 , Title: Meet critical food needs of targeted vulnerable groups in emergency situations.

	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 97	Estimated Total	FY 1998 Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 98	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	DA	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	1,630	0		1,630	0	0		0	0	0	0	1,467		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	CD	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	770	270		0	0	500		0	0	0	0	800		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0									0				0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			0	2,400	270		1,630	0	500		0	0	0	0			**0**	

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	1,630
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	270
PHN	500
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

USAID FY 2000 BUDGET REQUEST BY PROGRAM/COUNTRY Appendix K 29-Jul-98 01:24 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # 2 , Title: Increase capabilities of FFP partners to effect and sustain access to food..

	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 99	Estimated Total	FY 2000 Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 00	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	DA	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	3,780	0	1,701	2,079	0	0		0	0	0	0	3,402		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	CD	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	2,520	630		0	0	1,890		0	0	0	0	2,268		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0									0				0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			0	6,300	630	1,701	2,079	0	1,890		0	0	0	0			**0**	

FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	3,780
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	630
PHN	1,890
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

USAID FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country Appendix L 29-Jul-98 01:24 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # 2 , Title: Increase capabilities of FFP partners to effect and sustain access to food..					FY 1999													
	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 98	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 99	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	DA	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	2,412	0	1,080	1,332	0	0		0	0	0	0	2,171		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	CD	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	1,188	288		0	0	900		0	0	0	0	1,069		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0									0				0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			0	3,600	288	1,080	1,332	0	900		0	0	0	0			**0**	

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	2,412
[Of which Microenterpris	[]
HCD	288
PHN	900
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country Appendix M 29-Jul-98 01:24 PM

Country/Program:
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # 2 , Title: Increase capabilities of FFP partners to effect and sustain access to food..

	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 97	Estimated Total	FY 1998 Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 98	Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	DA	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	2,700	0		2,700	0	0		0	0	0	0	2,430		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
1	CD	Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	900	400		0	0	500		0	0	0	0	800		0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0													0	
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0									0				0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0													0	XX
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
		Bilateral		0														
		Field Spt		0														
		Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
Total Field Support			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM			0	3,600	400		2,700	0	500		0	0	0	0			**0**	

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- DA	
Econ Growth	2,700
[Of which Microenterpris	400
HCD	500
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- ESF	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise	[]
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	[]
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	0
FY 2002 Target Program Level	0
FY 2003 Target Program Level	0

OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET REQUEST (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

BUREAU: **BUREAU FOR HUMANITATIAN RESPONSE**

OFFICE: **Office of Food for Peace (FFP)**

OC O.E. BUDGET BY RESOURCE CODES	1998 ACTUAL	1999 TARGET	1999 REQUEST	2000 TARGET	2000 REQUEST	
Washington Offices & Bureaus Requests						
*** **Travel and transportation of persons**						
Training Travel						
Operational Travel	60,000.0	72,000.0	84,000.0	72,000.0	84,000.0	
Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel						
Site Visits - Mission Personnel						
Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	40000.0	80000.0	80000.0	80000.0	80000.0	
Assessment Travel	100000.0	48000.0	75000.0	48000.0	75000.0	
Impact Evaluation Travel						
Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)						
Recruitment Travel						
Other Operational Travel						
Subtotal OC 21.0	200000.0	200000.0	239000.0	200000.0	239000.0	0.0
*** **Printing & Reproduction**						
Subscriptions & Publications						
Subtotal OC 24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
*** **Advisory and assistance services**						
Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations						
Management & Professional Support Services						
Engineering & Technical Services						
Subtotal OC 25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
*** **Other services**						
Non-Federal Audits						
Grievances/Investigations						
Manpower Contracts						
Other Miscellaneous Services	15,000.0	18,000.0	25,000.0	18,000.0	26,500.0	
Staff training contracts	2,780.0	3,336.0	5,000.0	3,336.0	5,000.0	
Subtotal OC 25.2	17,780.0	21,336.0	30,000.0	21,336.0	31,500.0	0.0
*** **Supplies and Materials**	7,425.0	8,910.0	10,840.0	8,910.0	14,850.0	
Subtotal OC 25.3	7,425.0	8,910.0	10,840.0	8,910.0	14,850.0	0.0
*** **Equipment**						
ADP Software Purchases	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ADP Hardware Purchases						
Subtotal OC 25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL BUDGET	225,205.0	230,246.0	279,840.0	230,246.0	285,350.0	0.0
FILE:U:\MLUINA\123DATA\ 29-Jul-98						

Appendix O

P.L. 480, Title II Requirements

	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
P.L. 480 Title II	**$837.0 M**	**$837.0 M**	**$859.0 M**

Estimates of required Title II resources are derived annually through a formal collaborative process with Missions, and these estimates are included in the Congressional Presentation (CP). Although this process has not yet taken place for FY00, BHR/FFP expects to request approximately $859.0 million in total P.L. 480, Title II funding for FY 00, which assumes a 3% increase above FY 99 levels. The increase is requested to support a great need for increased Section 202(e) grant funding. This need is described below.

The FY 99 CP allocation of Title II resources is as follows: $63.6 million for SO 1 (PVO and WFP International Emergency Food Reserve activities); $363 million for SO 2 (PVO development activities); $155 million for WFP pledge (includes protracted relief operations and development pledge resources); $28.0 million in support of Section 202(e) grants; $9.9 million in support of the Farmer-to-Farmer activities under Title V of P.L. 480; and $217.8 million is unallocated. With these levels of funding the 1.55 million metric tons for development activities may be accomplished.

P.L. 480, Title II, Section 202(e) Grants

Through the Title II funds appropriated annually in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, $28 million is awarded to FFP under Section 202(e) to support the field operations of food aid programs. $10 million of these funds are earmarked for the World Food Programme and the remaining $18 million are used to support development and emergency food aid activities. In FY98 BHR plans to award $11.15 million of these 202(e) funds for development activities. Although not all TII development activities receive 202(e) funds and some have access to local currency through the monetization of commodities, it is safe to say that the average TII development activity receives approximately $186,000 per year to support its field operations -- a level FFP has determined is inadequate to cover all CS staff salaries and expenses, travel, training and technical assistance, procurement of vehicles and equipment, commodity and financial management, activity monitoring and evaluation, overhead, and other critical field operations associated with food aid management. Thus, BHR/FFP requests that the level of 202(e) grant funds available for FY 00 be increased from $28M to $50M. Of the $50M, $10M would be for WFP activities, approximately $26M would be used to support development activities and the remaining $14M for emergency activities.